

8050 cc  
10

# ADDRESS

FROM

*CAMILLE JORDAN,* *u*

MEMBER FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE RHONE,

TO HIS CONSTITUENTS,

ON THE

REVOLUTION of the 4th of SEPTEMBER 1797.

---

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH;

WITH

AN ORIGINAL PREFACE AND NOTES,

By JOHN GIFFORD, ESQ.

Author of a Letter to the Earl of LAUDERDALE;  
Two Letters to the Hon. T. ERSKINE, &c. &c.

---

O focii! (neque enim ignari fumus ante malorum)  
O passi graviores! dabit deus his quoque finem.

VIRGIL. *Æneid*, lib. 1.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1798.

ADDRESS

FROM

CAMILLE JORDAN

MEMBER FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE RHONE

TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

ON THE

REVOLUTION OF THE 18th OF SEPTEMBER 1871



FRANKLIN & FRENCH

AN ORIGINAL PREFACE AND NOTES

BY JOHN GIFFORD, ESQ.

Author of a Letter to the Lord of Liverpool  
Two Letters to the House of Commons, &c.

Gifford (John) (1814-1884) (British Museum)  
Gifford (John) (1814-1884) (British Museum)  
Gifford (John) (1814-1884) (British Museum)

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. M. LONGMAN, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1873.



ADVERTISEMENT.

**THIS** Address, which I promised my fellow-citizens so early as the 6th of September, has been long ready; but I have experienced the greatest difficulty in procuring a person to print it. I have still my doubts whether I shall be able to put it in circulation. Yet am I resolved to publish it; for if it should not fall into the hands of my fellow-citizens, they will, at least, know that it exists. Yes, they will know it; and they will exclaim, "Such is the Liberty, granted to men who have been accused of the greatest crimes, of answering the charges preferred against them! So horribly alarmed are their accusers, in the plenitude of their power, that no sooner does the defence of one of their victims appear than they annihilate it." This fact speaks for itself; and says more than my whole work. It will shew, better than I have been able to do, by means of what impositions this new Government was founded, and by what despotism it is maintained.

There is but one specious objection to this work which I have to apprehend: it will not proceed from those men whose conduct it attacks, but from several of the individuals who concur in ~~my~~ opinions. These may be induced to say "every thing which he advances is true; but why irritate, by the publication of such a work, a Government which our silence might dispose to the adoption of moderate measures?" I admire men who have thus the goodness to believe, that either our writings or our silence can produce any change in the disposition of those consummate tyrants; and I here pledge myself to give a full answer to this reproach in a subsequent publication. The National Representation has been already destroyed by weak and timid council; in the name of Heaven, let not our honour also, the only good that we have left, perish from the same cause. At least, let us give one solemn contradiction to the numerous falsehoods which have been propagated to our prejudice, and then be silent, if it should be found necessary.

This work has been composed in a very close retreat, and I publish it without having consulted any living being. The whole of the responsibility must, therefore, attach to me; and I willingly take it upon myself.

THE TRANSLATOR'S

P R E F A C E.

---

SINCE the commencement of the French Revolution several Representatives of the People, who have taken a leading part in the events, or even in discussing the principles which have marked the progress, of that mighty phenomenon, the extent of whose influence, past, present, and to come, on the moral, intellectual, and physical world, the most comprehensive mind, the most penetrating eye, is unable to descry; have adopted the expedient, not a very novel, nor yet an unnatural expedient, of appealing to their constituents as to a court destined to decide, *en dernier resort*, on their political conduct. LALLY TOLENDAL led the way; and, having given his admonitions as his last legacy, deserted the country which he was unable to save. BRISSOT came next, and, in an elaborate tract, sought to cast on his enemies all the odium of crimes in which, if he were not an immediate accomplice, he was certainly an accessary before the fact; that is to say, *he* opened the road which *they* pursued; *he* deposed the sovereign whom *they* murdered. This appeal was productive of no good

a. 2. confe-



consequences to himself; it procured no respite from punishment; and its wretched author, like many other revolutionary heroes, was consigned, unjustly, to a fate which, before, he had "most righteously deserved." BRISSOT's example was speedily followed by his Right Honourable Friend, and *confidential* adviser, the *Earl of Lauderdale*; but his Lordship's constituents were not less inflexible than those of the Gallic patriot; they considered his "Letters" with that degree of attention and coolness which is peculiar to the country, and dismissed him from their service. The lofty genius of Mr. Fox did not disdain to pursue the beaten track; and, being more deeply skilled, than his predecessors, in the art of political fencing, he wielded his weapon with greater dexterity, and cautiously acting on the defensive, ventured to make none of those home-thrusts, which, when quickly parried, (as in such a conflict they must necessarily have been,) expose the assailant to almost certain destruction. In short, his defence, very different from his attacks in the chapel of St. Stephen, was cautious and guarded. What effect, however, it produced on his constituents, he has had no means of ascertaining; except indeed their sense is to be collected from the clamours of those who are literally his *pot-companions*; from the patriotic songs of Mr. DIGNUM and Captain MORRIS, and the more patriotic toasts of Mr. JOHN GALE JONES and his Grace the Duke of NORFOLK. I am aware of the influence which the advocates of Mr. Fox will draw from his continuance in Parliament; but

but that circumstance affords no argument in his favour, as it would be easy to prove, that had his political conduct been the very reverse of what it has been, he would still, unless we suppose him not to possess the smallest degree of personal influence, (a supposition which it is conceived his friends will not be very willing to admit,) have had the honour of being returned by the worthy and independent Electors of Westminster.

But whatever advantages or disadvantages may result from addresses of this nature to the individuals by whom they are composed, it is certain that they are highly beneficial to the public, inasmuch as they afford the means of ascertaining the motives, and appreciating the conduct, of public men. Thus, the cause of truth is essentially served; and, indeed, we are more indebted to the conflicts which have taken place between the leaders of parties, and to the appeals to which those conflicts have given rise, than to any other circumstance whatever, for an accurate knowledge of the principal events of the French Revolution, and for the consequent ability to expose, in the fullest manner, the treacherous misrepresentations, and to refute, with accumulated force, the atrocious falsehoods, of those miscreants who, basely deserting the banners of their country, stand forward, with unexampled perfidy, as volunteers, or as *mercenaries*, in the service of an enemy intent on her destruction.

The Address of CAMILLE JORDAN will add much to this stock of necessary knowledge; it

contains a variety of important matter, and exhibits an exposition of principles explanatory of the views and designs of the faction which has usurped the Government of France. The author was one of those Members of the Legislative Body who were chosen subsequent to the establishment of the Constitution of 1795, and having distinguished himself as a decided enemy to violent or revolutionary measures, he was deemed a fit object of proscription; and was accordingly included in the sentence of banishment, extorted by a Turkish Directory from a prostituted Divan, which, after the memorable events of the 4th of September 1797, swept away what little remained of talent and integrity in Republican France.

The *principal* occurrences which marked that disastrous day have been detailed in the public prints, but it remains for the future historian of the Revolution to analyze the causes of these eternal divisions in the "indivisible" Republic; of the constant violations of freedom in that free country; and of the daring attacks, amounting almost to annihilation, of the elective franchise of a nation which sounds its boasted claim to pre-eminence on the perfection of its system of representation. When vain and presumptuous *theorists* gravely sit down to *frame* a constitution for a people who have lived under a regular government for many centuries; to *create* habits, to *form* manners, and to *settle* customs for them; what can be expected to result from such labours but a crazy fabric, liable to be shaken by every breath  
of



of faction, and subject to destruction by every rude shock of party-contention? Let the men who, six years ago, exultingly proclaimed the triumph of political wisdom, as displayed in the erection of this curious superstructure, now glory, if they please, in the wonderful accomplishment of their predictions; and the profound statesman, who, more recently, made the important discovery of its durability and permanence, proudly declaring, that, like the holy religion which its architects had proscribed, it was "founded on a rock," view, with *self-complacency*, with *self-gratulation*, the incontrovertible proofs of his own miraculous sagacity, and henceforth issue, with less diffidence, with less hesitation, those mighty truths, which serve to inform the mind of a BURDETT, and to fix the opinions of a RUSSEL! It is much to be wished, that the very correct and judicious writer here alluded to, having gained such immortal honour by his analysis of the war, would favour the public and gratify *himself*, with an equally comprehensive view of the causes and consequences of the late Revolution in France. I can assure him that he would find the subject worthy even of *his* pen, and the young Telemachuses of the Opposition will lose much if their patriotic Mentor withhold his instructions on a question of such magnitude and importance.

The immediate consequences of this event are the protraction of peace to an indefinite period, the farther diffusion of Jacobinical principles and destructive hostility, and the reduction of Europe to that dreadful state, which must, I fear, ultimately

mately leave, and that at no very remote period, no other alternative to all the regular governments of Europe, almost without an exception, than that of annihilating the Republic of France, or submitting to be annihilated themselves.

Extraordinary as the Revolution of September appeared to the generality of mankind, it was fully expected by those who had attentively considered the politics of France and the principles of her present rulers. This is not an opinion formed *after* the fact, but openly announced long before it occurred. Twelve months ago I published my translation of "The Banditti Unmasked," and, in my preliminary remarks, adverting to this subject, I observed—"The Jacobins and the Directory exert their utmost efforts to influence the elections, so as to establish the superiority of their own party; and, if they fail, they will again have recourse to *conspiracies*, in order to subdue that majority by violence which they could not overcome by lawful means; and, if their adversaries do not employ equal vigour and equal address, their plan will succeed." (p. 28.) This has been precisely the case, the end and the means have been such as are here stated. As to fabricated *conspiracies*, holden out as a lure to the people to secure their acquiescence in projects of personal ambition and in schemes of personal vengeance, they have been the favourite instruments of the Anarchists during the whole progress of the Revolution. Forged documents were employed, for political purposes, by the very first Assembly that

that pretended to give laws and a Constitution to regenerated France; but the French have not the merit of the invention; it is old as the days of ancient Rome; and the memorable notes of CÆSAR may possibly have served as a model for the royal porte-feuille of d'ENTRAIGUES, and the Austrian budget of MOREAU<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, so gross, so clumsy was the fabrication of this plot, and so little pains did its authors take to conceal their operations, that, in the preceding months of July and August, their plan was not only alluded to, in terms not to be mistaken, by the writers in the public prints, but was openly explained, from the Tribune, by a member of the Legislative Body.

Throughout the whole of this abominable transaction, such a shameful disregard of decency, such a scandalous contempt of public opinion were displayed by the Directory, and their Jacobinical accomplices in the councils and in the army, that the mind recoils with horror from the contemplation of a people, so destitute of energy, so sunk in abject degradation, so plunged into the gulph of slavery, as passively to submit to be the sport of such wretches, as tamely to bow their necks to a yoke still more odious than oppressive.

CAMILLE JORDAN has painted these tyrants in strong but natural colours, and has filled up the bold outline, which General DANICAN had sketched, in "his Banditti Unmasked," with a masterly

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 8 and 12 of the following Address.



hand. The summary of their virtues, to be found in p. 79, is particularly worthy the attention of the Reader, and ought to be contrasted with the very faithless account of some of the leading despots, given by DE PAYES, in what he calls his "History of the Five Men." The charges preferred against the proscribed Deputies, which none indeed, but the most ignorant dupes, or the most determined friends of the Jacobins, could credit for a moment, are repelled with success, and their fallacy and absurdity clearly and forcibly demonstrated. It is truly curious to observe, that one of the heads of accusation urged by the Directory, was the suppression of political clubs, which, they maintained, were calculated to promote the propagation of true Republican principles. JORDAN takes great pains to justify this measure; and, since the publication of his book, the Directory themselves have, by a formal mandate (Arrêté) of their own, dated the 4th of March 1798, dispersed all similar associations, and, in virtue of their supreme authority, shut up the places at which the members were accustomed to assemble. The reasons which they assign for this proceeding are too good to be given in any words but their own. "It is evident, that such monstrous institutions can have no other object and tendency than to accomplish the views of *England*, which are to make the choice of the people fall on the small number of intriguers who manage such clubs, and thereby to prevent pure and energetic

“getic Republicans from holding situations of  
“public importance!!!”

The fact is, that the Directory had themselves revived these associations for the purpose of turning the tide of public opinion against the moderate party, and, so long as they conceived them to be favourable to their designs, they justly regarded their suppression by the Legislature as an invasion of their high prerogative, and, consequently, as a capital crime. But no sooner had their tyrannical proceedings created a general disgust, and led them to suppose that their own institutions might be employed to their prejudice, than they deemed it necessary to abolish them; and thereby to commit that very crime themselves for which they had inflicted the punishment of exile on others. Their advocates in this country are left to panegyrize their patrons for this glorious display of republican equity. Mr. WAKENFIELD's classical pen would do justice to the subject; he might extract a suitable motto from the preface to his *Lucretius*; and, by way of episode, he might introduce, as an exemplification of directorial clemency, the pleasant story of the *Citizen*, pillored and confined in irons for two years, for the heinous crime of reading the defence of a legislator, who had been guilty of incurring the displeasure of his five sovereigns\*.

But it was not only in *France* that the moderate party had to encounter the calumny and the falsehoods of the Jacobins; even the *English*

\* See p. 111, note,

press, it seems, was prostituted to this base, this ignominious purpose. The honest part of the community will hear, with astonishment and indignation, the unqualified assertion of CAMILLE JORDAN, that there is an ENGLISH JOURNALIST IN THE PAY OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT<sup>3</sup>, who joined his efforts to those of the Jacobin faction at Paris, in order to promote the destruction of men, whose labours were directed to soften the horrors of the Revolution, to repeal the most infamous laws that ever disgraced a country, to give a death-blow to the infernal system of Terror, to meliorate, as far as possible, the situation of an oppressed, spiritless, and enslaved people, and finally to restore peace to desolated Europe. In any other times than these, a charge of this serious nature would be received with extreme caution; and an English mind would even be disposed to repel, with scorn, an imputation so foul and hideous. But, with grief I speak it, such is the baleful influence of Jacobinical principles, such the extreme degeneracy of the age, that the most licentious productions of the most licentious writers meet with encouragement and protection; that the *British* press is become the vehicle of *Gallic* sentiments; and that there is no action however base, no conduct however atrocious, but finds a willing advocate in the venal journalists of England, who occasionally stand forth as the apologists, even, of immorality, vice, rebellion, murder, and atheism!

<sup>3</sup> See p. 43.

When



When such a spirit prevails, the most improbable accusations obtain a ready belief.

What foundation CAMILLE JORDAN had for a charge which, slight and trivial as it may appear to those who feel themselves secure from its *effects*, imputes an offence of no less magnitude than a HIGH TREASONABLE MISDEMEANOR, and that of the worst description, it is not possible, *at present*, for me to ascertain. I shall only remark, that, if he spoke falsely, he could not speak unadvisedly; the subject of the paragraph, which brought forth the accusation, had been introduced in a debate in the Council of Five Hundred, some time before the Revolution of September; and two of the Directors, who must, from their situations, have known the truth or falsehood of the charge, were members of his party. But the inductions which these considerations suggest, are very far from amounting to a conviction of guilt; and the mild spirit of our English jurisprudence operating on a mind that is, thank Heaven! uncontaminated by French principles, has taught me to consider every man that is accused as innocent until his guilt be proved. Leaving, therefore, this question to be settled, between the writer of the paragraph, and the author of the "Address," I shall proceed to lay before the public the ground of JORDAN's complaint.

About the middle of last summer, the Directory, having formed their plan for the destruction of those Deputies who opposed their measures in the Councils, determined to dismiss from their service  
all

all such ministers as they knew or suspected to be attached to a system of moderation; and they replaced them by men blindly devoted to their will, and distinguished by the violence of their principles and the profligacy of their characters. This change, and the spirit which it betrayed, were noticed in the Councils at the time, and have drawn forth the animadversions of JORDAN in his Address. But they met with a very different reception from the conductors of certain Jacobin prints in England, who sympathized, most cordially, with the French Directory, and adopted all their sentiments with wonderful complaisance. In the MORNING CHRONICLE of Wednesday, the 26th of July 1797, a paragraph appeared, which, after commenting on the changes that had taken place in the French administration, changes which were there said to “embrace all that is great, either from the force of “talents or of numbers in the Republic,” proceeded thus:—“Whom have they exasperated? “*the Camilles, and other sycophants of royalty, who “formed, in the Fauxbourgs of London, the mad “and desperate project of a counter-revolution in “France; and who used, in the cabals which they “held in Southwark and other places, to be flippant “enough to boast of the knight-errant expedition “they were about to undertake. We speak in the “knowledge of many readers. The projectors of “the plot are already ashamed of their emissaries\*.”*

In  
 \* A writer, in a Morning Paper of the following day, made some comments on this paragraph; and, having exposed the ignorance of its authors, as to the nature and tendency of the events

In the *COURIER* of that evening the same paragraph appeared, with the alteration of a few words, "*It was, it seems, in London, that CAMILLE JORDAN, and other sycophants of royalty, formed the mad project of re-elevating the throne in France,*" &c. &c. Now, without admitting for a moment, the justice of JORDAN's accusation, I will appeal to every upright, impartial, unprejudiced mind, whether a writer *avowedly* in the pay of the Directory could have composed a paragraph more congenial to the wishes of his masters? If the answer be in the negative, I will farther ask, Whether the encouragement given to such writers be not a disgrace to the country? An Opposition, conducted as a true British Opposition has usually been, may render infinite service to the country, by exciting an extraordinary degree of zeal, vigilance, and circumspection, on the part of the Executive Government; but an Opposition on French principles is a monster in politics, that cannot exist without danger to the state. Men who can employ such tools as are employed by the scanty band which constitutes the mongrel-opposition of the present day, are Britons only in name. Of those

---

events then passing at Paris, observed,—“The same writer, with true christian charity, points out those members who oppose the Directory as royalists who conspired in London to promote a counter-revolution in France; which observation is admirably calculated, in the present critical state of things, when party-violence is carried to the highest pitch, to produce the assassination of those members, should the Jacobin party prove triumphant.”

tools



tools farther notice shall be taken in another place, where, perhaps, the nature of their employment will meet with more ample discussion.

I cannot, however, dismiss the subject without one additional remark: putting the *correspondence* and *connection* which the proof of JORDAN'S accusation must necessarily establish entirely out of the question, what opinion must the honest part of the community entertain of the conductors of British prints, who openly attack that party in France, which is most favourably disposed to promote, by a system of moderation, the interests and happiness of its own country, and to conclude a peace with Great Britain upon fair and equitable terms; and who constantly espouse the cause of the opposite faction, which is composed of public robbers, assassins, and regicides, who have repeatedly proclaimed an implacable hatred of England, and their fixed determination to erect a sanguinary democracy on the ruins of its ancient monarchy? Can men who do not blush to pursue a line of conduct so flagitious be surprized at the imputations which are thrown out against them? Ought they not rather to exult in the impunity which they are suffered to enjoy, and to glory in the contrast which *their* situation affords to the fate inflicted by their worthy friends and patrons, on those periodical writers in France, who have dared to question the infallibility of their opinions, and the purity of their minds? Whoever betrays a marked enmity to his own country, and a strong attachment to  
her

her enemies, is a rebel in heart, and should be driven, as a pest, from the society of good and loyal subjects. I am aware of the scurrilous attacks to which I expose myself by the use of such language as this; but let those who censure my expressions confute my doctrine; until that be accomplished, and I dare them to make the attempt, I know in what manner to treat their abuse. I know the fate that awaits me, should French principles or French arms ultimately prevail o'er my native land; I know what lists of proscription the ferocious tyrants of France have already prepared; I know what depredations they plan, what massacres they project; I know these scourges of mankind, these universal assassins, these modern "Men of the Mountains," *intus et in-cute!* But I shall ever regard the enmity of my country's foes as an honourable distinction, and would rather bow my neck to the guillotine of an English Directory, than have my reputation blasted by the praise of a domestic traitor.

In times like these it is a duty incumbent on every public writer boldly to proclaim his principles. When the country is in danger, neutrality is disgraceful; and to be passive, is to be criminal; the man who forsakes his post in the hour of peril is a deserter of the worst description. The crisis is awful beyond the conception of superficial observ-

Unde derivatur verbum "*Montagnards*," Mountainers: the *honourable* appellation assumed by the Robespierian party, the relics and proselytes of which are the staunch friends, to say no more, of the Jacobin prints in this country.

ers, and demands, in a peculiar manner, the united efforts of those true and steady friends to the Constitution, whose manly exertions, five years ago, in support of the violated laws, gave vigour and energy to the public mind, and rescued the British empire from ignominy, if not from ruin!

But to return from this digression, (if, indeed, reflections which naturally arise out of the subject can be so termed,) those persons who so obstinately persist, in spite of the clearest evidence that was ever offered to man, in representing our Ministers as insincere in their negotiations for Peace, and in ascribing the rupture of these negotiations to the unreasonableness of the British Government, are recommended to peruse with attention those passages of the following Address, which immediately relate to that important topic\*. They will there find that the protraction of the War was deemed necessary to strengthen the authority and to extend the power of the Directory; a power which they had acquired by fraud, and which they maintain by violence. They will also find, that the principle of the War and the grand obstacle to Peace, were "*the revolutionary doctrines*" of the French, and "*their mad project of destroying all thrones and subverting all empires.*" When they hear these solemn truths proclaimed by a Frenchman and a Legislator, they will perhaps be disposed to grant that belief to him which they have pertinaciously withholden from their own countrymen.

\* Page 86, et sequen.



On another topic of equal, if not greater importance, the acknowledgments of CAMILLE JORDAN afford an ample confirmation of the arguments which have been employed by British writers. I allude to the dangers that must result to all established Governments, *after* the conclusion of a general Peace, from the revolutionary machinations of the French. This subject has been ably discussed by the author of a sensible and well-written tract, intitled, "Remarks preparatory to the Issue of the renewed Negotiations for Peace;" and the authority which was quoted by me in support of my own opinions upon this point, was one which has every claim to attention and respect. There is no writer now living who has so intimate a knowledge of the principles and politics of the Republican Government of France as MALLET DU PAN: he had so closely studied their genius, character, and disposition, as to be enabled, at an early period of the war, to develope their views, and to ascertain their plans with clearness and precision. Thus all his predictions of the end and object of their public measures have been completely verified; and the eloquence and energy which he has displayed in exposing their gigantic system of destruction, has procured him the honour of being singled out, by the regicidal band, as the butt against which the shafts of their persecution and the arrows of their vengeance are incessantly directed. With savage fury they have hurried him from place to place, proclaiming the magnitude of his talents by the extent of their own malice.

lice. He long since explained the instability of treaties concluded with a Government that acknowledged no law but their own will, admitted no rule of conduct but their own interest, and suffered no engagements, however sacred, to interpose obstacles to the success of their ambitious and disorganizing schemes; and he pointed out the means which they intended to employ whenever the conclusion of a Peace should afford them an opportunity for promoting revolutions in Foreign States. CAMILLE JORDAN holds the same language and gives the same warning to the Powers of Europe: "*They will make Peace, but be assured it will be merely a transitory Peace; and, continuing to profess all the revolutionary maxims, and inundating all the countries in alliance with France with their apostles of rebellion, they will, in fact, fertilize, under the semblance of Peace, all the germs of a new and more sanguinary War.*" Surely such salutary admonitions, the justice of which is demonstrated by daily experience, will not be disregarded!

Other parts of this Address will shew the sentiments of the majority of the People of France to be, as I represented them twelve months ago<sup>7</sup>, decidedly hostile to the present order of things. If it be necessary, as the Author intimates, to "*render the people slaves in order to keep them Republicans,*" it follows, of course, that they are Republicans against their will, and would cease to be so, were

<sup>7</sup> See the Preface to "*The Banditti Unmasked.*"

they

they left to the exercise of their own free choice: indeed, whoever considers the multiplied calamities, of every kind, which that unhappy nation has experienced since the abolition of the monarchy, will easily conceive that there is nothing in the name of a *Republic*, or in any of its attributes, that can serve as a counterpoise to such keen and complicated sufferings. I have heard it asserted by persons, who, after visiting France, had traversed the neighbouring countries, that there are fewer true Republicans in the French Republic than in the monarchical States. If these discontented beings would remain passive, and pay a strict obedience and respect to the laws that afford them protection, they would be nothing more than objects of commiseration; as it is, I can wish them to experience no severer fate than banishment to the Land of *Liberty and Equality*, where they may freely partake of those Republican blessings which its rulers bestow with so lavish a hand. Of the present situation of that land, a land not only of *promise* but of *performance*, CAMILLE JORDAN has drawn a most alluring picture.

Speaking of the national resources, he observes, that “ *A general bankruptcy prevails throughout France;*” that her “ *public securities are still farther depreciated; the course of exchange still more and more against her; a weakened credit; an impeded circulation; and discouraged industry.*” Adverting to the Government, he tells us, that the people are ruled by a Directory who have “ *a power of life and death over all persons;*”

“ *a right*”



“ a right of spoliation over all families ; and the  
 “ opportunity of corrupting and intimidating all  
 “ men, by the influence of hope and the operation  
 “ of fear.” Not content with having “ reduced  
 “ a whole people to the most servile state of submis-  
 “ sion to insulgent tyrants,” they “ make them, at  
 “ the same time, proclaim themselves happy and  
 “ free !” And he lastly gives a comprehensive  
 summary of Republican blessings in the following  
 words :

“ The Constitution violated in more than forty  
 “ of its articles ; the respect which it commanded  
 “ irrevocably destroyed ; the National Represent-  
 “ ation violently dispersed and dissolved ; the shadow  
 “ of a Legislative Body reduced to the most abject  
 “ slavery ; the will and the rights of the People  
 “ treated with cruel derision ; the despotism of a  
 “ Triumvirate substituted in the place of that Liberty  
 “ which so much blood was shed to obtain ; the  
 “ glory of the armies tarnished ; an infamous bank-  
 “ ruptcy proclaimed ; the sources of wealth dried  
 “ up ; hope extinguished in every bosom ; and that  
 “ public spirit which constitutes the last resource  
 “ of the country, nearly annihilated by grief, at  
 “ seeing the nation again plunged into that gulph  
 “ whence it eagerly strove to extricate itself ; by  
 “ the fatal experience of the triumph of a few fas-  
 “ tious individuals over a whole people ; and of the  
 “ impotence of the moral effort of opinion, against a  
 “ rampart of bayonets !!!—Let those who like  
 the bill of fare, hasten to France to partake of the  
 banquet ; their depraved appetites can never be  
 satisfied

satisfied with true English food. Meanwhile the sound part of my countrymen will contrast these heavy calamities with the real blessings which they enjoy under their own free Government; they will be grateful to a superintending Providence for affording them the means of protection against the evils of rapine, desolation, and bloodshed; they will persevere in their noble resolution to defend, at all hazards, their liberties and the laws by which they are secured; they will emulate the glorious spirit of their ancestors, by crushing disaffection at home, and repelling invasions from abroad; and if, by circumstances alike unforeseen and improbable, their magnanimity should be rendered impotent, their efforts abortive, they will not survive the destruction of the Constitution, but perish beneath its ruins.

satisfied with the English food. Meanwhile the  
 food part of my countrymen will consist of  
 heavy calumny with the real blessing which they  
 enjoy under their own free Government; they will  
 be grateful to a superintending Providence for al-  
 lowing them the means of protection against the  
 evils of rapine, detraction, and bloodshed; they  
 will persevere in their noble resolution to defend  
 at all hazards, their liberties and the laws by which  
 they are secured; they will emulate the glorious  
 spirit of their ancestors, by crushing rebellion at  
 home, and repelling invaders from abroad; and  
 if by circumstances still more unfortunate and im-  
 posed, their magnanimity should be rendered im-  
 potent, their efforts will not be rendered in-  
 vain, the defence of the nation, but worth be-  
 lieving its cause.





**CAMILLE JORDAN's**

## **Address to his Constituents**

**ON THE**

**REVOLUTION of the 4th SEPTEMBER 1797.**

---

**FELLOW-CITIZENS,**

**Y**ou have already received one Address from me. The moment I witnessed the accomplishment of that horrid attempt with which we had long been threatened, the cry of indignation burst from my heart, and I felt it my duty to inform you that the national representation had been violated, that liberty no longer existed: but the strong agitation of my mind prevented me from giving you, at that time, any thing more than a rapid sketch of the transaction in question. I now sit down to complete what I then began, and thus to fulfil a sacred duty. Violence may have closed the gates of the senate against us; Tyranny may have issued her mandates of proscription; she may, in her language, as vain as it is impudent, declare that mission null with which we were honoured by

**B**

**you;**

you; but it has not effaced that indelible character which we received from your free and unanimous suffrages. All the ties by which we were united still subsist. Your representative owes you an account of his labours; an exposure of the tyranny which has been exercised against him; a manifestation of the truth; and woe be unto him if a pusillanimous fear could make him forget, for a moment, the obligations imposed on him by you, not only by the glorious title which you bestowed on him, but by the affecting benevolence which you displayed in bestowing it.

Besides I feel, that, in fulfilling this duty, I gratify the warmest wishes of my heart. Alas! is it in my power any longer to restrain the feelings which arise in my bosom when I contemplate the insolent triumph of crime? Can I refrain from seeking, throughout France, for hearts that beat responsive to, that sympathize with, my own? And where are they to be found, if not among you, citizens of the Rhone, Lyonnese; you who, in the midst of universal degradation, knew how to preserve the depositary of all the generous affections of the human mind; you, whom they dared to represent as the most ardent abettors of despotism, and who are, perhaps, more worthy than any of your countrymen to enjoy rational liberty.

You are not likely to mistake the value and object of this address. While I protest against tyranny, and shew the atrocity of the means employed to establish it, it is far from my intention to urge you to take up arms in order to effect its subversion.

version. Far from me the thought of exciting partial and indiscreet attacks, which would irritate your oppressors, without subduing them, and would cause that blood, which is so precious to your country, to flow in vain. No, no; persevere in the observance of that heroic patience, which you have hitherto displayed; persist in preserving that tranquil, but firm, attitude, that proud submission which circumstances rendered necessary, and which I myself advised you to adopt. The present times are undoubtedly calamitous; but trust to the invincible nature of things; be assured that the authority of the wicked contains within itself the principle of its own dissolution; be persuaded that if, in the corrupted, but enlightened, country which you inhabit, the usurpation of power against the will of the people has become a matter of facility, it is no longer possible to preserve it for any length of time, and that, sooner or later, the public opinion will prove to be the public force in France.

To enlighten that opinion, and to accelerate its progress, is the sole object of this Address.

I shall, for the present, confine myself to the consideration of the royal conspiracy of which we were accused, and of the measures for which it afforded a pretext. In a subsequent publication, if it be possible for truth to reach you, I shall explain the causes and the probable consequences of the triumph of our adversaries.

I can easily conceive, that a great number of you will be astonished, at first, to see me give a



serious answer to the ridiculous accusation of a royal conspiracy, which was not believed by any one of the persons who preferred it; and that you will complain of my giving a degree of consequence to the charge, by my refutation, which it otherwise would never have acquired. It is true that an accusation of this nature might be treated with disdain, if nothing were considered but the proofs adduced in support of it; but it has, unhappily, acquired, from concurring circumstances, a degree of importance which did not properly belong to it. It has become a pretext for violence, a title to usurpation, the basis of a new government. When we consider it as the means of accomplishing so great a crime, we must acknowledge the impropriety of neglecting it; and if no one individual in France gave credit to the charge, still it would be useful and just to throw all possible light on the transaction, were it only to confound the tyrants themselves.

But who is unacquainted with the degrading weakness of the human mind? Who does not know, that there is no lie so gross but, if advanced with boldness, and repeated with obstinacy, obtains some credit in the end? Weak imaginations are unable to resist the *redoubled* impression; and ardent imaginations seize it with the greater avidity because they are more deeply stricken with it;—their surprise itself becomes the principle of their illusion. If the liar prove victorious, what additional arguments does his triumph afford! Is not the success of a battle still regarded, by the ignorant multitude,

multitude, as it was in the barbarous ages, as a decisive proof of the justice of a cause, and even as the voice of God himself?

Let us not then disdain to oppose the most serious confutation to the most absurd charge. Let us prove that this royal conspiracy never had existence. Let us prove that, if it had existed, it did not furnish the shadow of an excuse for the attempts for which it was made the pretext.

Certain individuals accuse, People of France! two and fifty of your representatives, and two of your chief magistrates, who had hitherto been honoured with your confidence and esteem, of having conspired for the purpose of subverting that constitution which you had committed to their charge, *of re-establishing a throne, privileges, and vexations a thousand times more odious than those of the ancient system*<sup>1</sup>. What proof have they hitherto furnished of this astonishing fact which has appeared to them sufficient to afford a legitimate sanction to the infraction of all established rules, and to the overthrow of a mighty empire?

They could certainly never imagine that an assertion of this nature, advanced by *them*, required no justification.—They could not have supposed that the weight of *their* evidence was such as to render all other proofs unnecessary.—On what could they have founded such a supposition? What would in this case have constituted your security?

<sup>1</sup> See the beginning of the Proclamation which was addressed, by the pretended legislative body, to the people of France, on the events of the 4th of September.

Their *morality*, perhaps? Is there a man in France that would dare to make a serious appeal to it? Are they persons of that description who are allowed to offer their characters as the guarantee of their words?—Their interest? But were they not known to be our most determined, our most inveterate enemies? Were they not earnestly bent on the annihilation of our authority? Had they not just deprived us of it by force? How could they justify themselves without accusing us? How could they avoid passing for usurpers without making us pass for criminals? And what was more natural than to hold us up to the people as royal conspirators? Is not this an accusation which requires the fewest proofs, and excites the greatest hatred? Is it not the magical sound which sets a stupid multitude in motion? Is it not the powerful weapon that was incessantly employed, though never worn out, by Robespierre and his accomplices? Observe, then, People of France! the force of such an evidence! They are known impostors, our avowed enemies, who prefer against us a charge which they are interested to establish. Oh! what an admirable testimony is that of the oppressor against the victim of oppression! “I willingly give credit,” said Pascal, “to witnesses who cause themselves to be massacred;”—but must I give credit to the witness who massacres, and who stands in need of falsehood to justify the assassination?

But attend to them! they are far from being reduced to the necessity of relying upon their own  
simple



simple assertions; they have proofs of every kind to present to you;—our counsels, our military preparations, our legislative conduct. We will examine them all, demonstrate their nullity, and prove that they all turn against our accusers.

And, in the first place, how great is my astonishment at finding in these famous documents, destined to establish, beyond the reach of confutation, the conspiracy of two and fifty representatives of the people, nothing more than a few sheets written in a strange hand, in which only four of us, Pichegru, Imbert, Lemerer, and Merlan, are named and implicated! Let us check this first impulse of surprise, and, without inquiring what connection can exist between these individual charges and the general conspiracy which they are adduced to prove, endeavour to appreciate the value of each.

That strict regard to truth, which is religiously observed throughout this Address, demands one previous declaration: Though impressed with sentiments of esteem for those of my colleagues to whom these documents relate, I had no particular acquaintance with more than one of them; it is therefore impossible for me to oppose to all the actions which their enemies have been pleased to impute to them, those positive affirmations, which no prudent man employs without a thorough knowledge of a character, and the experience of a whole life. I have no other means then of reasoning on this subject but such as are common to all Frenchmen; I can only form my judgment

from the documents which are produced against them, and by such acts of their lives as are known to all men.

After perusing these documents, and considering these acts, I confidently ask the whole nation, if any man of candour can find in them any lawful ground of accusation against Pichegru? What equitable judge would condemn a citizen, of any description, on such proofs as these?—A conversation of the Count de Montgaillard, found among the papers of d'Entraigues<sup>2</sup>, has been quoted against him. In the first place, who can undertake to say that this paper was not fabricated or altered by the persons who produced it and certified its authenticity? Are they not all known to be the most zealous partizans of the triumphant faction? Why was not a secret of such importance to the country sooner disclosed? Why was the accusation deferred to a time when the party accused was no longer in a situation to answer it? Had not the porte-feuille of d'Entraigues been long pointed out as the fertile source of every species of imposition? Had not Doucet prophesied in the tribune, that it would speedily produce a royal conspiracy? Admitting the supposition, that such a paper had really been found on d'Entraigues, is it certain that d'Entraigues had not been deceived by an adventurer who had usurped the name of Montgaillard; or that he did not commit the circumstance to paper merely to

<sup>2</sup> M. d'Entraigues has since denied, in the public prints, that any such paper was found upon him.—*Translator.*

mark the imposition? Is it certain that Montgaillard himself was well-informed on the subject? Who is ignorant of the chimerical ideas which some of the emigrants take delight in cherishing? Is it certain that he was not employed in the composition of a romance? Who does not know the disposition of many men to augment their own importance by imaginary missions? Was not the person in question already known to have before composed similar romances, to have ascribed to the Vendéans, and to several others, compositions which were only the produce of his own fruitful imagination? Does not the recital bear evident marks of falsehood on the face of it? The scene is laid at Altenkirchen, where General Pichegru never had his head-quarters. He is supposed to have accepted pensions for his wife and children; whereas he was not married. Are not all the other parts of this account marked by the most striking improbability? They neither exhibit the common habits of men, nor the known characters of the persons who are brought into action. What must we think of this Count de Montgaillard, who sends into the French camp a printer of Neuchâtel, who did not know Pichegru, or any of his attendants, to extort from that general a disclosure of his most secret thoughts?—We think ourselves transported into fairy land, when we are told that the first time Pichegru, when surrounded by a number of persons, all wishing to speak to him, perceived this young stranger, he took particular notice of him; immediately conjectured that he had some important  
secret



secret to reveal, and endeavoured to fix a meeting with him while talking aloud to a general who was with him. Here the wonders multiply. Fauche, in his turn, conjectures that Pichegru has conjectured his meaning; and accordingly flies to the place of rendezvous, where the general had arrived before him. Having received all necessary encouragement, Fauche, after a short prelude, explains the object of his mission; and that Pichegru, who is known to be a man of prudence, and reserved even to his own friends; that Pichegru, to whom, at this time, such a formidable weight of responsibility attached, opens, at the first interview, his whole heart to a young stranger<sup>3</sup>, (who does not give him the slightest proof to convince him that he is really entrusted with such a mission,) and fears not to communicate to him his disposition to favour the cause.

Truly, here was an inconceivable boldness on the one part, and an inconceivable indiscretion on the other! Who could ever have thought that a single rencontre, a single look, would have sufficed

<sup>3</sup> I well remember to have read, either in the Journal de Francfort, or in some other paper printed in Germany, a letter from this FAUCHE, in which he disavowed, in the most positive terms, all knowledge of the facts here imputed to him. He has since, I understand, renewed this disavowal, upon oath, before the magistrates of Hamburgh. But the clumsiness of the forgery was little regarded by the Jacobins of the Directory, who knew, by experience, that no deception could be too gross to impose on the people of France. When their object was once gained, a detection of the means by which it was accomplished could afford no uneasiness to men who had a bayonet to oppose to every argument that could be employed against them.—*Translator.*

for the arrangement of an intrigue of the first importance between two men who were not only unknown, but must have been suspicious, to each other!

This correspondence ended as it began. Notwithstanding the extraordinary *instinct* which prepared beforehand such a mutual agreement and good understanding between the Prince of Condé and Pichegru, notwithstanding the desire which the one had to serve, and the other to be served, on the second message that passed all their projects were abandoned. The Prince of Condé, who, for three years, had been fighting in conjunction with the Austrians, whose whole hopes were centered in them, suddenly separates himself from them, and rather chuses to refuse the conquest of France when offered by Pichegru, than to avail himself of their assistance, and to suffer them to participate in his glory. Had he any other means, then, of effecting, alone, that counter-revolution which was the object of all his wishes? When he refused the support of Pichegru, where could he look for assistance, but to foreign powers? Did not that refusal place him in a state of dependence upon them more humiliating than ever? How, then, are we to account for this mad sacrifice of all his friends and of all his projects to a contemptible jealousy, in a Prince to whom no one ever denied the possession of common sense and a certain elevation of mind? Yet it was this first and only difficulty which, according to Montgaillard's account, induced him to give up his design, and even to break

off all farther communication with Pichegru. What reliance must have been placed on the patience and credulity of a whole nation, when men dared to advance such ridiculous fables, in so serious a cause!

There has also been produced I know not what correspondence, said to have been seized in the baggage of an Austrian general, and to have lain forgotten, during a long time, in the baggage of the French army. Here the same questions recur. Was the general present when the inventory of these papers was taken? Does he acknowledge them? Is it known how this correspondence came there? Is it certain that our enemies did not purposely sow these seeds of mistrust and dissention among our generals? Have the interpreters explained the true sense of the cyphers on which they have bestowed so much labour? Have they committed no error, hazarded no false explanation? Why was so long a space of time suffered to elapse before this mystery was revealed? Why wait until the party accused had his hands tied and his lips closed? How came it that the accusation was not preferred until the alarm gun of the 4th of September was fired?

Moreau\*, it is true, steps forward, at this glorious epoch, to bear witness against the vanquished; and

\* General Moreau, who was holden in such high estimation by the French, previous to the fourth of September, has incurred, by his conduct on this occasion, the contempt of all the moderate and rational people in France. The determined Jacobins are the only persons in Paris by whom he is now received



and his testimony had a considerable effect, at first, on the minds of many. But you must observe, that he does not speak to a single fact which had come under his own cognizance; he merely gives it as his opinion that the inferences to be drawn from these papers are unfavourable to Pichegru. But, admitting his veracity to be incontestible, does it follow that his opinion is infallible? He himself admits that these papers contain nothing that can furnish a judicial proof. What then are those proofs which are valid in the eye of an individual, but which are considered as null by a judge, particularly in a country where the conscience of the jury constitutes the sole ground of decision in matters of fact?

But, after all, is it clear that Moreau's veracity is so incontestible? There was a time, I know, when he was the object of a confidence the most honourable to himself; but what must we think of a man who denounces a friend to the supreme authority; who denounces him, too, without taking any of those precautions which a delicate and generous friendship must suggest? What must we think of a man who, having been long in possession of these documents, only produces them at a time when they might serve to accelerate or to justify

ceived with cordiality. The conduct of this General affords a striking contrast to that of Pichegru; while the latter returned from Holland penniless and in debt, the former contrived to amass in that country (unless he is grossly belied) no less a sum than six hundred thousand livres, by the aid of which he now figures away in the public places at Paris, decorated with costly trinkets, and attended by a train of flatterers.—*Translator.*

the

the fatal revolution that was then preparing;—who while, on the one hand, he represented Pichegru as the leader of a party whose object was to destroy the happiness of the country, wrote, on the other hand, to several members of that party, assuring them of his devotion to their cause? How can we give credit to a man from whom we are compelled to withhold our esteem? How confide in one who is in contradiction with himself, and who, at all events, has deceived one party or the other? Unhappy Moreau! suddenly become faithless to your country and to your friend, fallen, in the eyes of so many Frenchmen by whom you were esteemed, from that station of glory which you so worthily filled; if your heart be endued with sensibility, how much is your fate to be deplored!

But supposing these documents to be authentic, and the statement of facts which they contain to be real, would that be a sufficient ground for accusing Pichegru of having betrayed the Republic? In fact, what do we find in them? A correspondence begun, but productive of no consequence. Who would venture to affirm that it was his intention to execute all the schemes he had proposed, that he was not merely actuated by a wish to open a communication in the enemy's camp favourable to his own views, to learn their designs, their disposition, and their strength, and, perhaps, to inveigle them into some snare? What skilful general would have neglected so favourable an opportunity? Do not the facility with which he opened himself to a stranger, and the promptitude with which the  
other

other party put a stop to all communication, could in aid of this supposition? In short, how many suppositions occur on this subject, all of them more rational than that of Pichegru's defection.

Lastly, do not the rules of logic, as well as a regard to truth, require that the induction resulting from the perusal of a few papers should be weighed against the induction resulting from his general character, and his public conduct? Who can be easily persuaded to believe that this man, of simple manners and frank behaviour; who early embraced the cause of the Revolution; who served it with so much zeal and candour; who at a time when his base accusers, slaves or accomplices of the tyrant Robespierre, laid waste the internal parts of that fine empire, defended it abroad, rescued our captured frontiers, taught our warriors the road to victory, and, incessantly tempering valour with humanity, caused that republic which *they* dishonoured to be respected, should have suddenly consented—after the destruction of Robespierre, when the Republic, emancipated from the yoke of its oppressors, began to merit a more sincere homage—to give up his former opinions, and to abandon, in the eyes of all Europe, that victorious party whose hero he was?

What an extraordinary man, then, this Pichegru must have been! But what could have occasioned such a strange contradiction in his conduct? Interest?—Holland had laid her treasures at his feet; he had refused them, and returned to the obscure place of his nativity, humble and poor. Glory?—

Had



Had he not attained the summit of glory? And what addition would the honours of that man admit of whom the public voice, in France, proclaimed the greatest of her Generals and the most modest of her Citizens? Vile calumniators, who dare to lay your profane hands on his immortal palms, who deny his patriotism which was established by victories, while your own was only signalized by crimes,—what are your contemptible and doubtful correspondence, when compared with those irrefragable monuments erected at Weissembourg, at Fleurus, on the banks of the Rhine, the Scheldt, and the Waal, and in so many other places, the scenes of his courage and his glory? Ah! when the historian, at some future day, shall relate the fatal triumph which you have obtained, he will content himself with saying—“ In order to prove “ that they had saved France, they were obliged “ to admit the supposition that Pichegru had betrayed her.”

Yes, you had, indeed, betrayed what *they* call the country, generous Pichegru. That day on which you shewed as much firmness in the senate, as you had previously displayed courage in the field—that day on which you arraigned, with dignity, their criminal intrigues, you was holden up as a conspirator, you was marked as a traitor. But let not your great mind be tormented by reflecting on the supposed ingratitude of your countrymen; let not the dignified tranquillity which you preserved in the midst of misfortunes, be interrupted by the dread of seeing your glory obscured by

by the calumny of the wicked ! No ! to have been hated by the tyrants of your country, and proscribed for promoting the sacred cause of virtue, was the finishing stroke to your honours. Your name is repeated with emotion and respect ; and it is universally acknowledged, that your heart never conceived a design that was not noble in itself, and that had not for its object the happiness and liberty of your country.

Testimonies like these, however, are, in this case, unnecessary. If the papers really established the defection which they announce, what proofs would they supply against the present conduct of Pichegru, which is the sole object of the accusation before us ? Could they suppose that no one would attend to their dates ? What ! in order to prove a recent, an existing conspiracy, you produce documents relating to other times and other circumstances, to projects which, according to your own confession, were no sooner conceived than abandoned ! But admitting that Pichegru the General had, at that period, listened to certain propositions from the Prince of Condé, does it follow that Pichegru the Deputy must have opened a new correspondence with him ? Admitting that, previous to the establishment of the Constitution, he had it in contemplation to substitute the authority of a King for that of the National Convention, does it follow that, under the empire of that Constitution, at a time when he was chosen to defend, when he had the power of contributing to perfect, it, he must have conspired to subvert it ?

C

Lastly,

Lastly, and this argument is decisive, if not only his former defection, but even a recent act of treachery on the part of Pichegru were demonstrated, what have we to do with it? What inference is to be drawn from it against fifty-three other conspirators who are accused with him? Where are the documents that inculpate them? Where are the proofs that Pichegru had entrusted us with his designs, that we approved them, that we concurred in them? In virtue of what law do they pretend to establish this unity of conduct between us?—We gave him marks of our esteem!—You voted with us in order to raise him to the rank of President, which he obtained by an unanimity of suffrages almost unparalleled in the history of our assemblies.—He voted with us in the Council!—But a great number of members, whom you still suffer to retain their seats, were united with him by the same tie. If this concurrence of sentiment were received as an infallible proof of a criminal connection, why not include them all in the same charge? But who would dare call the members of a deliberative assembly to account for the actions of those whose opinions they approve? What standard does a man possess for deciding on the conduct of every member of his party? How, even if he blamed their actions, could he reject their votes? If it were possible to know Pichegru, if it were a duty to unmask him, by whom could it be done but by you, Cowardly Calumniators! who, as you say, had been so long in possession of irrefragable proofs, and who, nevertheless, instead of producing them,



them, encouraged our error by your criminal silence, and by the suffrages which you yourselves lavished on him.

So much for Pichegru and our connection with him. I shall not stop to investigate the proofs exhibited against Imbert-Colomes; they are not deserving a serious discussion; they consist of letters of recommendation to Imbert from the Prince of Condé, which our modest accusers assure us were found in the porte-feuille of the Marquis de Bésignan. Nobody is better acquainted than yourselves, Lyonese! with the nature of this conspiracy of Bésignan's, which was made a pretext for disturbing the peace of so many citizens of irreproachable character. That mad adventurer, who passed himself for an agent of the Princes, was solemnly disavowed by them. Would it be matter for surprize if he had supported an imaginary title by forged letters of recommendation? Besides, how does this private correspondence affect us? Which of us had any concern with it? Which of us even knew of its existence? Was ever any thing so ridiculous as to render a legislative body responsible, not only for letters written by one of its members, but even for all letters which such member might have received?

I hasten to the declaration of Dunau, and the correspondence seized at Lemaitre's, the only papers which can be said to belong to the persons to whom they are ascribed. But, in the first place, what audacity is it again to adduce, as proofs of an existing conspiracy, documents relating wholly to

past events, and published, some of them six months, and others so long as two years, ago? Could it be supposed that the nation would descry in them any thing more than they had seen at the time of their publication? If they had really any weight, if they discovered criminals, if they proved the existence of crimes, why did not you seize the persons accused as soon as the papers came to your hands, the very moment when you gave them to the public? Had you not, at that period, all the means that were necessary for prosecuting them? Did not the majority of the legislative body vote according to your wishes? Did not the danger to which the Republic was exposed render it a duty in you to adopt speedy and effectual measures? How could you repress, for so long a period, that zeal for the Constitution which operates so powerfully on your minds? Why, by giving the alarm to the culprits, did you afford them an opportunity to escape? Who can believe that, after the secret of their intrigue was exposed to the world, they would continue to pursue the same plan? Impostors! Who does not perceive that you could then discover, in these papers, no foundation for a lawful charge; that the want of a pretext for your iniquitous conduct was the sole motive that induced you to bring them forward again; and that you yourselves are the first witnesses in our favour?

A second perusal of these celebrated papers only serves to encrease my astonishment, and impels me again to ask, how any men could have the effrontery

frontery to present such documents to an enlightened nation? They consist of a few scraps found at Lemaitre's house, directed nobody knows by whom or to whom, not saying one syllable of the present plot, not denouncing one individual amongst us, not reciting one fact, and containing nothing more than the vague opinions and reveries of some stupid politicians, who would be even too much honoured by having them considered as grounds for prosecution of themselves. This was the light in which they were viewed by the National Convention, when they admitted, without hesitation, the justification of Doulcet, the person most implicated in them; and it was in this light that they were considered by the pretended Legislative Body themselves when they erased Doulcet's name from the list of exiles, on the bare mention of this former decision in his favour<sup>1</sup>.

I next observe a long denunciation, the work of a man, from whom the hope of reward or the dread of punishment has extorted the secret of a cause which he calls his own; who violates all his oaths, who betrays all his friends, and who sets out by proclaiming his own infamy, and by devoting himself to the contempt of all parties. What a witness! Implicit credit ought certainly to be given to all the assertions of such a man as this! He cannot possibly be suspected of exaggerating facts in order to enhance the merit of his treachery! He cannot be suspected of having accused innocent

<sup>1</sup> See the account of the sitting at the Odeon, on the 4th of September, as given in the *Moniteur*.



persons from motives of revenge or of personal interest!

Yet, after all, what a contemptible denunciation it is! It announces the hope which the Royalists found on a portion of the Legislative Body, and on the approaching elections; as if the ideas fondly cherished by men, who had long inhabited the land of illusion, could regulate the proceedings in such a cause as this; as if a hope were ever admitted as the proof of a subsequent act; a project, as the demonstration of its success! He speaks of the meetings at Clichy, and yet he confesses that he was not acquainted with a single member, acknowledges that he did not know which of them were disposed to support his cause, and represents Lemerer and Merfan as the only intermediate agents between the party and himself; Lemerer, who seldom attended the meetings, and Merfan, who was, at that time, prevented from appearing there by the law of the 3d Brumaire (Oct. 24th). He mentions them, without explaining when, in what place, and in whose presence, he had seen them; he mentions them; and his own impudent assertion is the only proof which he offers of the fact. Thus ends that famous denunciation, which does not even exhibit, against any one person, a charge deserving the attention of a man of sense.

Yet these are all the documents which the Directory have hitherto produced! These constitute the sum total of their proofs of the existence of so vast a conspiracy! And although they  
daily

daily promise new documents, which I promise to explain whenever they shall produce them; although the Directors and the Legislators mutually encourage each other to accelerate their fabrication, they have not yet dared to bring them forward from that workshop of iniquity in which they are preparing them, from that workshop in which MERLIN, who must understand my meaning, *delivering to his clerks some rough materials, orders them to work them up into a royal conspiracy, under pain of that dreadful chastisement which has been actually inflicted on one of them.....* Observe, Frenchmen, all the weight of the induction which results from this circumstance in our favour, and to their prejudice:—How demonstrative is this want of proof! How eloquent this silence! If fifty-two representatives had really conspired, how many written traces of their conspiracy must have remained? Is it credible that no spy would have detected, no accomplice betrayed them? Is it credible, particularly after the discovery of the plot, when the victories of their opponents carried every thing before them, by the operation of hope or the influence of fear, that proscription, misfortune, which generally suffices to produce accusers even of the innocent, should not have brought forward one witness against the guilty? Once more let me observe, how complete must the innocence of fifty-four objects of proscription be, against whom, Calumny, in the plenitude of her power, has been able to produce no other documents than the reveries of an adventurer, and the insignificant falsehoods of a traitor!

“ But in defect of written testimonies, there  
 “ exist”—said they—“ material and living traces  
 “ of the plot. The conspirators wrote but little,  
 “ but they were constantly in action; they had a  
 “ fixed place of meeting, they went thither fre-  
 “ quently, they went to Clichy”—to *Clichy*!  
 Question them no farther; do not press them to  
 know what we could do, or say, there. Do not  
 expect from them, any particulars, or explanation,  
 of what passed at those meetings. *We went to*  
*Clichy*; that alone ought to satisfy you.—Alas!  
 Do you not know, that it is the first maxim of the  
 great art of Revolutions, to create certain words,  
 which, though destitute of all signification in them-  
 selves, may engender, in the ardent and weak  
 imaginations of the multitude, a crowd of ideas,  
 which acquire encreased efficacy from the very cir-  
 cumstance of their being indeterminate and ob-  
 scure? It is the empire of darkness which children  
 people with monsters and phantoms; it is the secret  
 of those terrible words by means of which the Sybils  
 or Pythia terrified nations, overthrew empires, and  
 had sufficient force, of themselves, to realize the  
 predictions they announced. Our Revolutionists  
 of September had not forgotten the mighty advan-  
 tages which their predecessors had constantly de-  
 rived from this magic power of signs over the ima-  
 ginations of men. They, therefore, resolved to  
 have a new sign of their own, and they adopted  
*Clichy*;—*Clichy*, repeated in the tone of an oracle,  
*Clichy* placed at the head of all their fatal predic-  
 tions; *Clichy* associated with the misery of the  
State-



*State-creditors, with the calamities of war, with the massacres of Republicans; Clichy, incessantly surrounded by the phantoms of Pitt, of Condé, and the king of Blankenberg, has become, in their hands, the grand scare-crow of the stupid multitude.*

In the place of these ridiculous chimeras, let me present you with a rapid sketch of the causes which gave birth to the club at Clichy, and of the objects which it was intended to promote.

Clichy was instituted during the preceding session, and several of those very men who are now our adversaries assisted in its formation. The Legislative Body was then divided, like all other deliberative assemblies, into two rival parties, which struggled for the pre-eminence. One of these parties assembled regularly at the hotel de Noailles, to discuss the measures which they meant to propose in the council; they endeavoured at once to acquire a true knowledge of their own interest from a variety of contending opinions, and to add to their strength by an unity of conduct. The experience which they had had of the nature of public assemblies had convinced them of the superiority which men who previously regulate their proceedings among themselves must invariably have over others who act without concert, merely from the spontaneous suggestions of their own minds. It became necessary for the opposite party to follow their example; they wished to balance, by similar means, the strength which their adversaries derived from this institution. The hotel de Clichy was the  
place

place fixed upon for their meetings. There, an intelligent and courageous minority, closing their ranks, sustained the efforts of a corrupt majority, became at times the majority themselves, and, during a space of sixteen months, supported a defensive campaign, the prudence of which excited the admiration of politicians, and ought to be remembered with gratitude by all France.

The features by which these two parties were characterised were calculated to determine the choice of deputies that were to compose the new Third, to be elected in the month of March. The old club of Noailles, composed of the relics of the Jacobins, declared itself the defender of all the Revolutionary laws which surrounded the Constitution at its origin, and were contrary both to its spirit and its text. The Constitution, and the Constitution alone, was the watch-word at Clichy. Reinforced with a great number of the members of the New Third, this society extended its influence, without changing its nature. The members continued to deliberate on the means of insuring the literal execution of the constitutional act, and they discussed the opinions and the conduct of the candidates for the posts which the Legislative Body had to bestow. They endeavoured to oppose some obstacle to the growth of that detestable faction, which already began to manifest their designs, and threatened to effect the dissolution of the National Representation.

This is a faithful account of the meetings at Clichy. But what necessity is there for entering into particulars?

particulars? Whatever our enemies may invent or advance as to its object and design, I have but two very plain questions to put to them. They wish to make the club at Clichy serve as a proof of the grand conspiracy of which they accuse us. This can only be understood in two ways; either all the members of the club were in the secret of the plot, or this secret was confined to a small number who rendered the club the instrument of their schemes.

Will they say, in the first place, that the whole club were accomplices in the conspiracy, and only assembled for the purpose of deliberating on the means of carrying it into effect? But then they will have to explain the reason why, out of more than two hundred members of the Legislative Body who attended these meetings, only forty-five were denounced by them as conspirators; why the rest remain unpunished, and why a great number of them are still allowed to retain their seats. They will have to explain to us, why several were apprehended who never, or very seldom, attended. Pichegru and Willot, whom they represent as our leaders, went there but once; Portalis, Siméon, Tronçon du Coudray, and several others, constantly refused to attend. Our accusers, therefore, admitted that a mere attendance at Clichy did not render a man a conspirator. Besides, were these meetings at Clichy holden in secret? Were not the place, the day, the very hour of meeting publicly known? Was not every person who chose to go admitted? Did not a number of indiscreet persons belong



belong to it? Did not traitors themselves succeed in gaining admittance? Was not the result of each sitting known to the Directory the next day? Was it not communicated to the public by the Journalists? What an absurdity to suppose that conspirators, and particularly loyal conspirators, would have thus carried on their deliberations in the face of all Paris! And how happened it, that, of so many speeches made and resolutions taken, before such a multitude of witnesses, nothing was collected that could afford, I will not say, a proof, but even the slightest indication of a conspiracy?

Will they rather be disposed to affirm that the club at Clichy only contained some few conspirators who controuled the other members without communicating their own plans? Let them explain to us, in the first place, by what means they ascertained the existence of a plot at Clichy; how they learned the secret; and how, at the distance they were at from us, they guessed our object better than those persons who daily attended the meetings, and who, by their own confession, never had the smallest suspicion of it. Let them name their authors and produce the informations they received. Why do the men who cover the walls with a fastidious and insignificant collection of scraps found at Lemaitre's, conceal from us those documents which can alone give any kind of support to their cause? I now argue on the supposition that the plot really existed? Let them next explain how they learnt to distinguish, amidst that crowd of deputies, the real depositories of the secret; those whom they call the leaders? How they came

came to suspect that several who presided, who spoke at Clichy, who appeared to have an influence there, were not the criminals; and that others who never spoke, who attracted the attention of no man, were nevertheless the mysterious chiefs of the conspiracy? What was the characteristic feature that taught them to make this distinction? Lastly, and this is the grand problem—let them explain to us how those leaders, in whose hands Clichy was so powerful a weapon, consented to dissolve the meeting, even proposed its dissolution themselves, and that at a period when there was the greatest necessity for its existence, one month previous to the term said to have been destined for the development of all their plots.

Yes, such was our candour, such our sincere disposition to enforce the execution of the existing Constitution, that, when the establishment of clubs in every quarter threatening to disturb the tranquillity of the state convinced us of the necessity of a general law against political societies, although the exception in this instance would have been strictly legal, although there was no similitude or connection between the associations formed by the members of the Legislative Body for the purpose of preparing plans for the sanction of the council, and availing themselves of the advantage of a more deliberate and profound discussion, in the functions which they were sent by the people to discharge; and clubs formed by individuals, having no share in the formation of laws, and *having nothing to do but to obey them*, and whose discussions, therefore,

4

would

would only tend to produce a spirit subversive of public order; we would not suffer our conduct to afford the smallest pretext to ignorance or prejudice. We ourselves sacrificed an useful association in order to put a stop to dangerous enterprizes; we ourselves, in order to extinguish party-hatred, consented to dissolve that sacred phalanx which we had formed around the ark of the Constitution. You may judge, People of France! by this fact, of the rectitude of your faithful representatives! What did we leave undone that could tempt them to abandon their criminal designs? What did we not do to convince them that the object of our meetings was to prepare the means of resistance and not those of attack? We ventured to entertain a hope that their savage minds would be softened; we ventured to believe that there were some friends of truth and peace among them. Ah! if they had really possessed any portion of candour; if, as they pretended, they only wished to defend the Constitution, and to serve the country, this trait of our conduct would have undeceived them for ever. That day would have seen all factions disappear; and, instead of availing themselves of our generosity to promote our destruction, they would have consigned to oblivion all past animosity, and have come to mix with us and to rally under one common standard.

They adduce, as the last material proof of our conspiracy, the military preparations of our committees of inspectors. They tell you that we intended



tended to attack the Directory, in the night of the fifth of September, that the arms were prepared, the cards distributed, the signals for rallying agreed upon; that they had found several members of the two councils assembled, at four o'clock in the morning of the fifth, in the room appropriated to the Committee of Inspection of the Council of Elders, in order finally to settle the whole plan of hostility.

I begin by declaring, for my own part, that I never had the smallest knowledge, either of the cards, the signals, the registration of names, or the collection of arms. But I will not have this declaration considered even as the shadow of a proof. I go still farther, and will admit, for a moment, the truth of all these facts which were unknown to me. Men were enrolled, armed, stationed; be it so: what are we to conclude from thence? Where is the proof that they were prepared, as it is asserted, to act on the following night? Where are the proofs

\* It is necessary to observe, in this place, for the benefit of those who, in great events, are curious to be informed of particulars, that the Directory had, in fact, intended to make their attack in the night between the third and fourth of September. A misunderstanding (for when men are engaged in the important task of saving their country, they cannot think of every thing) occasioned the attack to be deferred till the proclamation of the Directory was at press. Their siege was begun like that of the Abbé de Vertot. It was posted up at the break of day, and gave an account of the attack of the preceding night; the inhabitants of Paris were very much astonished when they rose in the morning to learn that *the advanced posts of the Directory had been driven in*, while those who lived nearest to them had heard nothing of the matter. It was therefore deemed expedient to abandon this attack of the posts, and to represent

proofs that they were designed for the purpose of attack, and not merely for that of defence? Were we forbidden to have recourse to means of defence? Could the fear of attack appear chimerical? What! When the determination to effect our ruin had been adopted several months before; when the means were preparing in the sight of the public; when troops, advancing at different points, violated the constitutional circle, and openly proclaimed the object of their march; when the Directors gave a vague and evasive answer to the serious charges preferred against them; when ministers of approved fidelity were replaced by men whose very appearance was an indication of approaching calamity; when soldiers in disguise, and declared Jacobins, flocked to the metropolis from the armies and the departments; when every thing that passed at their gloomy meetings was known; when information was received that they had been sent for by one of the Directory, and were paid by him, in the expectation of a speedy revolution; when a system of defamation against the two councils' organized at Paris;

sent it as an error of the press; which they corrected, by saying that the Directory were to be attacked the following night. It was only a slight change of the past to the future.

*See, in all the Journals, the proclamation of the Executive Directory to the people of France, published on the morning of the fourth of September.*

This perfectly corresponds with the system adopted by the Jacobin prints in England, (whose conductors seem to harmonize completely with the Directorial Journalists of France,) for bringing the two Houses of Parliament into discredit with the people. Fortunately, there is no reason to apprehend, that the *same effect* will be produced by *their* patriotic efforts; *our* soldiers, though

Paris, and diffused through the armies, had excited the troops to seditious and insolent threats; when, in the blind transport of their rage, they had talked of turning their arms against the legislators of their country; when the Directory, called upon to say what measures they had taken to repress this audacity, justified it in their messages, and proved themselves accomplices in the deed; when Augereau, the principal author of these addresses, who first seduced the soldiers and then made them sign them, and who carried them himself to Paris, had just received, as the reward of his crime, the command of the troops in that city; when all the journals, all the pamphlets of the faction, announced the expected Revolution, saying, "a few days more, and those who are called the conspirators will be annihilated,—a few days more, and what they call liberty will be saved;" when the president of the Directory himself, in a solemn harangue, did not fear to allude to the designs which he had formed; when a thousand private advices from persons

though Mr. Gilbert Wakefield has the effrontery to stigmatise them as "*the vagabonds and outcasts of society*," as "*mere profligate mercenaries*;" a libel the most gross, the most false, and the most infamous, on a description of persons, to whom it is but a poor compliment to say, that, taken collectively, they are much better members of society than himself. — Our soldiers, I say, have too much sense as well as loyalty to be seduced from their duty to their sovereign and to their country, by the desperate exertions of profligate scribblers, who are devoted to the service of their enemies. — But, methinks, it would be but consistent in Mr. Fox, Mr. Erskine, and their political associates, who, upon *some* occasions, where it suits the purposes of *party*, betray such extreme anxiety for the honour of parliament, to bring these daring libellists under the cognizance of the House. — *Translator.*



in the service of the Directory and of the ministers, gave notice of an approaching explosion, varying indeed as to particulars, and differing as to the way, but all affirming, that the national representation would be dissolved, and its most energetic members sacrificed; when the fatal day drew nigh, a train of artillery arrived at the military school, and the superintendants employed by the inspectors of the two councils were arrested; when the fury of the Jacobins could no longer be restrained; when predictions were multiplied, and all the infallible signs and tokens of an immediate Revolution became visible to every one:—in the midst of so many hopes and alarms; when there was not a Jacobin but proclaimed the speedy triumph of the Directory; not one honest citizen but dreaded a speedy attack upon the two councils,—was that legislative body, on whom all the hopes of the nation were centered, in whom the fate of the nation depended, to be condemned for taking those precautions which self-preservation required for maintaining themselves in the post in which the people had placed them, for making the inviolability of their members, and the independance of their authority respected? Were they to be condemned for soliciting, for accepting the services of good and loyal citizens, who had offered to reinforce that guard, whose numbers were too few, and whose fidelity was suspected; and to fight at the most glorious station which a Republican can occupy, in defence of a national representation attacked by assassins? And when, at last, in that disastrous night, the two  
committees

committees of inspectors, specially charged to provide for our defence, and to watch our enemies, had learned that every thing was prepared for the fatal expedition; when the cannon, fired at Seve and Versailles, had given the signal of attack; when detachments of troops were parading the streets in silence; when they had already occupied the heads of the bridges; when the sacred barrier had been broken down; when a hundred pieces of artillery threatened to scatter death around; we were not to be permitted to assemble, with our committee of inspectors, in order to devise the means of a defence the most lawful. We were not to be permitted to receive our defenders, to give them arms, what do I say?—To mount our horses ourselves, to call to our aid all the good citizens of Paris, and to rush, at their head, on those parricidal phalanxes! And if blood had flown; if thousands of their soldiers had been sacrificed; if the Directors themselves had fallen on the steps of their palace; could we have been reproached for it? Could they have done any thing more than accuse us of the attempt which they themselves had made?

The event, however, has proved, beyond the possibility of contradiction, that, lawful as these precautions would have been, we did not take them\*. Those arms, with which we were said to be

\* In the publication which I have announced, I shall explain the conduct of the Council.—*Author.*

be provided, were no where to be found; those men who were ready to defend us did not exist; though we had five hours to convene them, not one summons had been issued, not one citizen appeared to defend us; and all these mighty conspirators fell into the hands of their enemies without the smallest attempt at resistance. Pichegru and Willot, in company with our inspectors, remained quiet at the post assigned them by the law, and opposed with confidence the Constitution alone, to the parricidal swords that were directed against their bosoms: and Pastoret, at the head of eighty Deputies, and the venerable Marmontel, at the head of fifty, asserting the rights of the national representation, under the very feet of the cavalry sent to charge them, were the only phalanxes which we employed on that day, which they have called the day of their dangers and of their glory.

Who, after these facts which were exhibited in the sight of all France, could still give ear to this ridiculous fable of our royal conspiracy?

Their conduct, indeed, requires explanation; for it was evident to every one, who had paid any attention to the progress of the Revolution, that the Jacobins would never suffer the provisions of the Constitution to operate as impediments to the accomplishment of their nefarious designs. It was clear that they would employ force, should intrigue be found inadequate, to achieve the destruction of their enemies. How these enemies, then, could neglect to employ even those means which the Constitution itself had placed in their hands for counteracting their efforts, and warding off the fatal blow with which they were threatened, is to me, I confess, inconceivable. I shall wait with impatience for CAMILLE JOURDAN's promised explanation of this mysterious business. — *Translator.*



Who could descry, in this transaction, any other conspiracy than the open aggression of certain rebels, determined to dissolve the national representation by force of arms, and to substitute their insolent will for the reign of the law? Yet let us not disdain to listen to them still; let us answer patiently, and at length; and investigate to the very bottom this gulph of iniquity and falsehood.

Unable, as we have been, to furnish documents, and to bring witnesses of the act of conspiracy itself; contradicted even by all the facts they have exhibited, and the witnesses they have produced, they have endeavoured to supply the want of legal proof by moral inductions; and these they pretend to derive from our characters, and our opinions. Some of us, they say, were emigrants who had returned known royalists; who, being attached to monarchy from interested ambition and fanatical opinions, must necessarily have engaged in a royal conspiracy. This is certainly a strange mode of arguing on an accusation so solemn, which involves such serious considerations, and which requires such clear and incontrovertible evidence. Perhaps it was useful to certain men to conspire; therefore they *did* conspire: perhaps they conceived the design; therefore they carried it into effect. How shameful it is to be reduced to such arguments as these! what revolutionary logic! But admitting this induction to be allowable, we will shew what a false consequence they draw from an assumed fact, and how falsely and

impudently that fact is assumed by them. First, as to the false inference:—They affirmed, that there were some individuals of our party, who were evidently interested in the triumph of royalty. Was this affirmation sufficient? Was it not incumbent on them to apply this charge to all? For did they not all conspire? And how could they conspire, unless there was a mutual understanding between them? For if there was a single person who had no motive for restoring royalty; who had, on the contrary, the most urgent motives for opposing its restoration; are you not aware, that the concert necessary for the existence of a conspiracy is broken; that such a person could not only not concur in it, but must necessarily promote its dissolution?

Now, that there was at least one of this description, that there were several of them, whose names were inscribed on the lists of proscription, who will have the boldness to deny? Who has not those famous lists fresh in his memory? Who does not recollect with what a blind rage they had been drawn up; in what a confused manner the names of all their enemies had been thrown together? How they had connected individuals, whose astonishment at finding themselves together, was extreme? In good truth, the names selected to figure in a royal conspiracy displayed wonderful sagacity in the parties who chose them. What an admirable assortment of emigrants, royalists, and fanatics!—Carnot, Barthelemy, Cochon, and

and several members of the National Convention . . . !

What ! was Carnot in such haste to replace a king on the throne !—that Carnot, who had seated himself in his place ; that old member of the Committee of Public Safety ; that famous veteran of the Revolution, who, having attained to the first dignity in a Republic, whose victories he had prepared, saw the ambassadors of so many courts humble themselves before his purple !

What ! did he engage in the royal conspiracies—that minister, Cochon, who denounced them ; who brought forward those very documents of Duntant's, which they now dare to produce against us ; who disclosed to the public, in his account of one single conspiracy, the secret of all the conspiracies ?

What ! were we joined in our attempt to expose the defects of the Revolution by those old members of the Convention, who had given so many proofs of their inflexible attachment to it ; who were devoted to its cause by the ties of interest and the bond of opinion ; and whose past conduct afforded so solemn a pledge of their future principles ?

What ! did Barthelemy also wish to subvert the Constitution :—he whom that very Constitution, in reward of his long services, had just raised to a station of glory the most gratifying to his heart ;—the man who was known throughout Europe by the moderation of his mind, and was cherished by a friendly nation which was never lavish of her esteem ! You may still hear, at this very time,



amidst the cries of calumny, an unanimous exclamation, extorted by gratitude and justice, through the whole territory of Switzerland, attesting his zeal, and giving the lie to the accusations preferred against him by his base persecutors. Was it probable, or rather was it possible, that men like these should have been concerned in the plot which has been laid to their charge? What bond of union was there, what similarity of sentiment, between men of this description and royalist conspirators? And what skilful hand could have recalled to that harmony, which was essential to the success of such a deep conspiracy, such a mass of discordant elements?

But I will go still farther, and maintain that it is not true that any of us were interested in the success of a conspiracy for the restoration of royalty; that, so far from any attempt being made to execute the project, the very idea could never have been entertained.

We are told, that there were some emigrants amongst us; as if emigrants who had returned to their country, and had their property restored, must necessarily retain the principles and habits of the unfortunate class, whence it was their lot to be taken; and as if the public did not know how to appreciate that charge of emigration, when proceeding from the lying mouths from which it issued. The fact, People of France! is simply this:—three or four representatives, who never left their homes, were included in those fatal lists in which avarice and revenge heaped together  
the

the names of all whom it was their interest to pros-  
 scribe ; and four or five others, after the 31st of  
 May, at a period when the most horrid system of  
 terror prevailed, sought an asylum in a foreign  
 land. Well ! which of them would be afraid to  
 acknowledge this ? where are the laws that con-  
 demn, the opinions that accuse them ?

Did not a Louvet take refuge in Switzerland,  
 and a Talleyrand in England ? And, to adduce  
 nobler examples, which of you, Lyonnet, did not  
 seek to rescue his head from the axe of the exe-  
 cutioner ? And for this we are called emigrants !  
 Oh ! what a glorious emigration ! What an  
 honourable proscription ! and it is thus that our  
 very right to the confidence of the people is em-  
 ployed as a pretext to calumniate us in their  
 eyes.

We are farther told, that if there were no  
 emigrants among us, there were, at least, men  
 who were devoted to royalty from motives of am-  
 bition. I should be glad to hear by what profound  
 calculation these men had been seduced from their  
 duty. What had the members of the New Third,  
 who are here alluded to, so much to complain of  
 in the new, so much to regret in the old, system ?  
 Was it on them that important dignities were  
 formerly conferred ? Was it for them that re-  
 wards and power would have been destined, in  
 future, in preference to so many noblemen and  
 emigrants, to more ancient and approved ser-  
 vants ? Was it not their class that the Revolution  
 was calculated to favour ? Were they not the  
 persons

persons who reaped the sweetest fruits of the Constitution? They saw themselves, under a system of liberty, surrounded by an enviable popularity, raised by the free suffrages of their fellow-citizens to the head of *the first empire in the world*\*, and placed in a situation the most favourable for the display of talents and the gratification of an ambitious mind. And to confine myself to the case of your own Deputies, Lyonnese! let me ask, (if I had any pride in my heart, any relish for true glory,) what I could expect from a King, in the full enjoyment of his power, so gratifying as the honour which you conferred on me, on that day, when, exercising your constitutional rights, you gave me your votes, and sent me to the senate to represent such a noble portion of the People of France?

But, forsooth, we were seduced by interest! Was it not the interest of those *new* men, who were but little known in a revolution of which their great and moderate tempers had led them to

\* It is curious to trace, amidst the shocks of contending factions, and the horrors of repeated revolutions, the regular prevalence of that strong feature which constitutes the invariable characteristic of a true French mind. Whether its object be *Le Grande Monarque*, or *La Grande Nation*, still national vanity predominates. It might not be mal-à-propos to ask the rulers of *the first empire of the world*, how they can tamely submit to have all their harbours blocked up, and their colonial possessions captured by the fleets of a little island. But the arrogant pretensions to which this vanity gives birth I can easily pardon for the sake of its origin. So far from condemning in Frenchmen an excess of attachment to their native soil, I heartily wish that, in this point (and in no other) every Englishman would follow their example.—*Translator*.



be the silent witnesses, or else the victims, to prevent new revolutions, in which their persons, their fortunes, and their habits of tranquillity, which constituted their sole happiness, would be inevitably exposed to the danger of destruction? Was it not the interest of those men, who, even by the confession of their most ferocious enemies, were possessed of a certain urbanity of manners, a certain integrity of character, not to abandon that honourable post, nor to resign their political conduct to the influence of the basest seduction? And woe be to him, who, laying his hand upon his heart, does not feel it revolt at the bare thought of that scandalous venality imputed to men, whose characters had been hitherto exempt from reproach.

But if they mean to do us greater honour, by supposing us to have been really actuated by a royal or a religious fanaticism, we might certainly content ourselves with giving no other answer to such an unsupported assertion than the lie direct. We might observe a profound silence on the subject of our opinions until some farther proofs should be supplied, some pledges of a different nature to THE ASSERTION OF THAT ENGLISH JOURNALIST IN THE PAY OF OUR GOVERNMENT, who, ascribing to me a ridiculous importance, represented me as the hope of the emigrants and priests;—an assertion which Bailleul had the indecency to quote against me in the Tribune, at a time when I was not there to answer him. But no; I will speak to these opinions; I will anticipate our accusers; I will myself denounce to  
you,

you, People of France! the *royalism* of a small number of your representatives. And why should I conceal it? Yes, there might be some persons among us who entertained sentiments favourable to royalty; some who, examining our new Constitution in their closets, thought they descried some imperfections in it; who suspected, that an executive power, vested in the hands of a single person, might acquire greater activity, greater dignity, a greater portion of that moral force which diminishes the necessity of a political force, and that such a reform, far from undermining liberty, would place it on its true basis. Well, what is to be inferred from this? What advantage will they derive from this avowal? Is such an opinion contrary to the Constitution? Does it imply a desire, a design to subvert it? Must a royalist of this stamp necessarily be a royal conspirator? The wretches, who only reign by imposture, would feign persuade you to believe it, People of France! But you will not give ear to them; no, Citizens; candid yourselves, you will believe a man of veracity, who knew these royalists whom he denounces; who saw the bottom of their honest hearts; who fears not to unveil them to all France, and to hold up such royalists to the esteem of all enlightened Republicans.

Yes, they were royalists, but they were your representatives; a republican Constitution had been committed to their care, and if they had been reduced to the necessity of choosing between the love of an opinion, and the discharge of a duty, those

those men who had a nice sense of honour would not have even hesitated for a moment.

They were royalists, but they were philosophers; a profound knowledge of human nature had taught them to consider absolute perfection as a chimera; they knew how to tolerate abuses which they deplored, and to obey laws which they condemned.

They were royalists, but they were legislators, and attached to monarchy by no idolatry of individuals; by none of those habits which influence the vulgar, but solely by a regard for public order and social happiness. They considered, before every thing else, the actual wants of the people; and remarking, that repose, after so much agitation, was the most urgent of their wants; and that it was essentially necessary to impress their minds with a conviction of the salutary influence of order and peace; they would have been careful not to interrupt that happy state of tranquillity, and have shuddered at the idea of purchasing, with the blood of their fellow-creatures, a more rapid degree of perfection in their social institutions.

They were royalists, but they were citizens; they knew that they had nothing but their voices in this vast empire. They kept their most favourite systems subordinate to the national will; they only demanded a free manifestation of that will, and, knowing no better mode of ascertaining it than by a strict adherence to the Constitution itself, they waited in respectful silence until the people, after  
a fair



a fair trial, should decide on its merit, and point out the means of reform.

They were royalists, but, I will maintain, the most prudent and the most enlightened of royalists; they were fully aware, that if the monarchy could ever be restored, it could only be by the free and lawful declaration of the public will. That all violent commotions, all attempts contrary to law, far from accelerating, would inevitably retard its restoration; and, therefore, they thought that to conspire in favour of royalty was in fact to labour against it.

Such, Frenchmen! such were the royalists who were intermingled with so great a number of sincere Republicans; such the fanaticism by which they were actuated; such the conspiracy which they meditated. Let me once more ask, what is there in such opinions that is not strictly conformable with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution? Did its founders lay claim to infallibility? Was a belief in its absolute perfection made a law of the state? Was it not, in fact, defective in some of its parts? Was it not susceptible of improvement? Does it not itself point out the means? Must it not be effected by the will of the people? What is the will of the people but the will of individuals? Individuals then may project, desire, and demand a reform; and if, in the mean time, they obey the laws, and hold their own will in constant subjection to the general will, what more do they do than exercise a right in fulfilling all their duties,  
and

and exhibit to their fellow-citizens that admirable union of honest censure with virtuous obedience that distinguishes and does honour to a free people.

I am aware, that such are the deep traces which the revolutionary tyranny has left amongst us, that these old simple truths are almost considered as the offspring of a counter-revolutionary spirit; but a nation who calls herself free and enlightened, must nevertheless accustom herself to profess these principles; her new rulers must accustom themselves to hear this language sounded in their ears; they must be made thoroughly sensible, that the people, in France, can only be Republicans by their own will<sup>10</sup>, that they have a right to change that will, and that whoever wishes so to do, without disturbing the established order of things, is no conspirator, but a free man. And lastly, if this victorious nation preserve her present institutions, on which depends the happiness or misery of so many millions of men, it must be in consequence of the most deliberate conviction of their excellence, of the most free declaration of the will of all her citizens, and cer-

<sup>10</sup> This assertion of Camille Jordan's stands, unfortunately, contradicted by fact. If he had said, that the French could not long remain Republicans against their will, his observation would have passed without notice; but when we recollect, that the Republic was established by acclamation, on the motion of a strolling-player, but *three short months* after *seventy-six* out of *eighty-three* Departments had *voluntarily* and openly proclaimed their attachment to the Monarchy, and their determination to support it, we may be permitted to doubt whether the will of the people has ever been consulted in the form of the Government, since the Revolution; and we know but too well, that, whatever that will may be, they have neither the spirit to declare, nor the means to enforce, it.—*Translator.*

tainly not from the vain fancies and low interests of a few individuals, who must necessarily determine among themselves, that, for the heroes of the second of September or the twenty-first of January, there is no situation more convenient, and no retreat more secure.

As to the religious fanaticism with which some of us are reproached, we very well know what that means in the language of these profound philosophers. To preserve some respect for the maxims transmitted to us from our forefathers; to believe in the salutary influence of religion on public manners; to assert, with energy, the sacred right of freedom of worship; to invoke a legislation that will protect these sound doctrines, which increase the number of good parents, good husbands, and good citizens; which reaching the hearts of men, that the laws cannot reach, carry to them, with the dread of crime, the reward of virtue.—Such it is to be a *fanatic*; and most certainly there were many among us who would not disclaim that honourable character. For my part, I accept it; I thank them for having deemed me worthy to bear it: I thank them for having praised me by so much abuse; for having honoured me with so much hatred. Yes, that fanatical love of the dearest rights of so many of my countrymen glowed in my bosom, and never will be extinguished;—but still I repeat the question, what similitude is there between such fanatics and royal conspirators? Was not our Constitutional Authority sufficient to ensure that freedom of worship and to make it respected? Could  
not



not the Constitution and Religion exist together? Are not religious doctrines unconnected with the forms of government? Do they not, in a special manner, enforce the necessity of toleration, hope, and forgiveness? Can they ever sanction, in the eyes of a man of sense, actions which affect the happiness of his country? And although such fanatical legislators were, no doubt, far removed from that enlightened sphere in which the Bailleuls, the Chagals, and some other great philosophers of the present age are accustomed to move, did we not still retain, in the simplicity of our hearts, and the darkness of our prejudices, a sufficient stock of natural lights to enable us to see that the morals of a people are not to be restored by civil war, nor the Deity honoured by the murder of men?

So much for the inductions which they affected to draw from our characters and our interests. I shall now proceed with the last supplement to the proofs that are wanting—our legislative conduct. It is in their delineation of that conduct that, as they affirm, the conspiracy is visible. I shall certainly not be expected to refute, in this place, all those vague reproaches for contempt of patriotic institutions, or the fall of decadary festivals, the degradation of republican signs, the outrages sustained by purchasers of national domains, and a thousand other declamations of this kind, with which the Directory larded their long and pathetic proclamations; I am only accustomed to reason on distinct facts, and I shall wait until those are specified for which we are responsible. Still less will it be re-

E

quired

quired of me to examine a number of speeches, delivered in the tribune, which have excited their complaints, in order to analyse the expressions, and justify the sense". I shall also wait until they have

"Duty to myself, and to you, Lyonese! requires, however, that I should examine and justify one of these speeches. By this single example you will be enabled to appreciate the validity of all similar charges; you will learn to ascertain the candour of those men who watched, with such incredible vigilance, every word that fell from our mouths, in order to render them subservient to their own perfidious designs. You have read, in several proclamations of the Directory, that there were members of the Council so daring as to make an apology for assassination! You have found the same assertion in the speeches of some of their hirelings or their slaves; and lately, Chénier, going beyond all his predecessors, and, as usual, a poet when he writes prose, maintained that murder had not only been preached up but *deified*.—*Deified*! It is a happy expression. But you are probably at a loss to know, Lyonese! to what member they allude; who that savage representative is, that was so destitute, not only of humanity, but of common decency, as to pronounce, in the tribune, an apology for murder, and the apotheosis of assassins?—I am that man. You would scarcely have suspected this, I conceive, and I hear you ask what could have thus altered the mild manners of your representative?—I will tell you how he incurred the reproach. There was a most violent debate in the Council, and the Hall resounded with the blustering eloquence of Bailleul, who reproached us with the oppressions and assassinations of the Patriots in the South. This speech was intended to pave the way for a message from the Directory, which accordingly arrived; it stated that massacres were daily committed within your walls, and accused you, Lyonese! to all France, as giving countenance and protection to regular bands of assassins and counter-revolutionists. Your Deputy flew to the tribune, gave the lie to the infamous calumny, and vent to his indignation against the calumniators. Certainly, if at such a moment, when defending a country so dear, when repelling an attack so cowardly, when his mind was inflamed by the thoughts of so many calamities, some imprudent, some unguarded expression had escaped his lips, no man of sensibility, no just man would have dared to reproach him with it: but no such expression did escape him; he did not utter one syllable that he is disposed to retract, and

have declared what the words were which betrayed the secret of the conspirators; and what degree of consent

and his indignation was honest as the heart whence it flowed. I will explain the only phrase that excited their anger.

After having proved that your city had never enjoyed greater tranquillity than it had for the last three months, under the genial protection of the paternal administration chosen by yourselves, shewing, that if, at a remoter period, some assassinations had been committed there, as in every other part of the Republic, through the negligence of the government, they could not be imputed to any deliberate system, to any counter-revolutionary movement, but to the mere impulse of personal revenge; I exclaimed—“*Alas! in what city can such revenge appear, I do not say excusable or allowable, but more natural!*” These were my very words, and I call upon my colleagues to bear witness to them. Well! this is the phrase which they denounced with so much fury: it was in this phrase where revenge is expressly condemned; where it is merely represented as *natural*, that they discovered the apology, the *deification* of murder.—What is there in such an expression that I can have a wish to reform in the hour of cool reflexion? What is there that, not only the orator, but the philosopher, must not expressly approve? Is every thing that is natural allowable? Weakness, errors, passions, are the offsprings of nature; but is that to say that they are sanctioned by reason? Are all our inclinations then lawful? Are all our impulses virtuous? How many actions are there which neither the philosopher can foresee, nor the moralist approve? Is not revenge specially included in this class? Is there any movement of the human mind which virtue is less able to controul? And how great is its impetuosity, in particular, when, exercised for a father, a brother, or a friend, it seems to ally itself, as it were, with some moral sentiment, and becomes the fanaticism of affection itself? Observe the humanity of these virtuous citizens! Such doctrine even rouses their sensibility. It is not sufficient to agree with them that revenge is forbidden; they cannot even bear to hear it said that it is natural. Their beneficent nature revolts at the thought. O! ye, whom Heaven endowed with souls so expansive, so replete with sensibility! Your error is certainly a glorious error, it does honour to your hearts; but still it is an error, and reason can never resign her immoveable rights. Remember, then, that human nature, such as it is with us, sometimes encourages sentiments that are unlawful, and even cruel. Remember, that some of the actions which are alike defended by laws hu-



consent we gave to the conspiracy. I shall confine my reply to the two charges which alone, by their direct application, seem to deserve a more serious examination ; that of having expressly violated the Constitution by our laws, and that of having, at least indirectly, sapped the buttresses which serve to support it.

In the first place, I shall observe that our conduct, considered under this double point of view, being only presented as an indication of secret designs, as a proof of our conspiracy, it would not be sufficient for our adversaries to demonstrate that we had, in point of fact, violated the Constitution, and sapped some of its supports ; it would be necessary for them farther to prove, that these formal violations, that these indirect attacks were essentially connected with the design of subverting it. A false interpretation of the sense of the Constitution may lead to an innocent infraction. The dictates of passion and the heat of party may induce a de-

---

man and divine, are natural, and some unnatural ; and if you wish for an example that shall teach you how to distinguish the one from the other, listen to me, Chénier. — It is natural for a son to plunge his dagger in the bosom of the man who has murdered his father ; but it is not natural for a brother to leave a brother to perish on a scaffold \*, when he might save him if he pleased. The first is culpable ; the last atrocious : the first is a man ; the last, a monster !

---

\* Andrew Chénier was sentenced to be guillotined, together with Baron de Trenck, the Marquis de Montalambert, and three and twenty others, on the 25th of July 1794 ; his brother was then a member of the Convention, and in habits of intimacy with the leading members of the Government ; and it is notorious that a single word from him would have been sufficient to rescue Andrew from the scaffold. But they were both "*Mes of Letters* ;" and it has been said, that the former was jealous of the talents of the latter, and therefore suffered him to perish. — *Translator.*

parture from its plainest provisions; the infidelity, in that case, would be criminal, but it would not be counter-revolutionary; its authors might be censured and punished, but they should not be treated as conspirators.

You must again observe, before we enter upon the discussion of their merits, how strange it is that these charges should be confined to us. You talk of laws, of measures adopted; were they not, then, the measures of a majority? Did fifty-two members form that majority of the two Councils? Did they even form a considerable portion of them? If the adoption of those laws were a crime, the criminals must be numerous. Why, then, are we alone denounced, alone punished? Why do you suffer so many of our accomplices still to sit among you? They were not in the secret of the conspiracy, you will say; they were seduced.—But, by what rule have you learned to distinguish the deceived from the deceivers? In what manner have you drawn the line of distinction between the two classes? Was your principle infallible? Did you even adopt or follow any principle? Unfortunately, the journals of your deliberations exist; they exist, and in them are to be found none of those characteristic marks which enabled you to distinguish two and fifty conspirators among five hundred legislators speaking and acting in concert; and you do not condescend to explain to us the reason of such different treatment of persons whose conduct was the same. That aggregate body of slaves, worthy rivals of the senate of Tiberius! take it upon themselves to convince Europe of the blindness of their obedience to their

tyrants, by neglecting even to explain the motives for the proscriptions which they were commanded to sanction?

They were seduced!—And how were they seduced? By our arguments doubtless, the only force which it was in our power to exert. It was possible, then, to advance very specious arguments, since they could impose upon four hundred and fifty legislators, and since the ascendancy of your great talents proved insufficient to dispel the illusion! the violation, then, was not so evident but that enlightened men might readily be deceived? Our innocence, then, was possible, your proofs doubtful, your accusation rash.—They were seduced!—But if they really suffered themselves to be seduced so far as to violate the Constitutional Code, their seduction might serve as a plea to absolve them from the crime of conspiracy, but not from an act of deplorable weakness. That weakness was itself a crime in the eye of the law. Why do you not denounce that, at least, to the tribunals? Why do you suffer the offenders to sit in your hall, to ascend your tribune? Oh, my Colleagues! do not be afraid that they will yield to this provocation. They are themselves too much afraid of exposing their own degrading nakedness to the nation; and you have become necessary to them to conceal a number that excites pity, and an assemblage that creates horror.

Let us now consider what are those articles of the Constitution which they say have been violated by our laws. The discussion cannot be difficult, because the documents are in every body's hands; and the slightest attention will suffice to show whether



we have been guilty of prevarication, or they of calumny.

The Constitution, in proscribing Emigrants, forbade the creation of new exceptions in their favour; and we made laws to recal the refugees of Toulon, and of the Upper and Lower Rhine.

But if the Constitution interdicted the creation of exceptions, it did not forbid the application of exceptions already made. Did all the unhappy men whom we recalled to their homes form a new class? Were they not included among those refugees whose return was permitted? Were not their motives for flight the same? Did they not fly at the same epoch? Had they not the same excuses? What more did we do than acknowledge this analogy, and apply to them the privilege which had been granted them by a preceding law? That is to say, we only pronounced upon facts without touching principles, and gratified the wish of humanity, by discharging the duties of justice.

The Constitution had forbidden certain political societies, and we took upon ourselves to forbid all such meetings.

But did the Constitution, when it said, *such societies cannot be formed*, add, *all others have a right to meet*? Cannot that be interdicted by legislative authority which is not interdicted by the Constitution? Cannot that be decided by a subsequent law which is not settled by a fundamental law? Nay, did not the Constitution itself expressly declare, that all associations *injurious to public order* should be proscribed<sup>12</sup>? Was not this tendency to destroy

<sup>12</sup> See the 360th Article of the Constitution.

public order to be decided by circumstances? And who was to judge of those circumstances but the legislative body? And if the nature of those circumstances became such, that, all political associations being dangerous, or that some of them being innocent, and others guilty, the impossibility of distinguishing with any certainty the one from the other rendered it necessary either to tolerate them all, or forbid them all, by enacting a law of general interdiction; did we not adhere to the text of the Constitution, and respect its spirit?

Again, this Constitution, while it permitted, if they please, political associations, no doubt intended that the authorities instituted by itself should be maintained, that the laws should be executed, that the national sovereignty should be respected; and, when *factional men, assembling in all parts of the empire, loudly proclaimed their seditious designs, affected to speak the voice of the whole nation, attacked with audacity the acts of their representatives, and when their meetings thus became the principle and the means of a plot tending to destroy the Constitution itself*, could we contemplate, in a state of cowardly inactivity, such dreadful disorders, and not oppose to the greatest of all evils, the most efficacious of all remedies?

The Constitution had established the equality of religious worship, and *we* endeavoured to promote an established religion.

What! because we had proposed to make the people, at length, enjoy that freedom of worship, *which had hitherto only existed in hypocritical proclamations?*

*clamations?* Because we had dared to claim for a religion professed by an immense majority of the nation, (a religion which had been precipitated from the summit of splendour, and subjected to the yoke of the most atrocious persecution,) that protection which had been promised to all? Because we had conceived a design to move for the repeal of certain laws of police, which, even exceeding the severity of constitutional principles, went so far as to forbid the sectaries of the different persuasions all those external marks of their worship which are so dear to religious minds, and all those public signs which no one ever thought of proscribing even in governments which openly protect an established religion? See then to what extremes of madness they are driven by the hatred which they have sworn to the Catholic Religion, and by the gloomy terror which it infuses into their minds. According to them, to wish for its existence is to wish for its predominance; not to join them in persecuting it, is to persecute themselves; to force them to look at it, is to compel them to believe in it!

What! because we had expressed a desire that the ministers of every persuasion should be relieved from the necessity of taking oaths and making special declarations! Because we were of opinion that the Constitution having meant to confound them with the general mass of citizens, we had no power to separate them by our laws from the rest of our countrymen! Because we believed that governments are strengthened by the benefits they confer, and not by any vain forms of submission which they can exact;  
and



and that, if any rebels really existed, it was much better to restrain them by laws, than to harass them with oaths; to subject them to the vigilance of the public, than to force them to conspire in secret! And even this laudable desire, this philosophic and constitutional opinion, was not adopted by many of us whom I could point out, and their patriotic apprehensions prevented it from becoming a law<sup>13</sup>.

What!

<sup>13</sup> I forgot, in my allusion to the design of preparing a law for regulating public worship, to speak of the bells, of those famous bells which made so much noise in France; and, certainly, our adversaries will never forgive me for this omission. I must here make a candid acknowledgment of our faults. I admit, that, on this subject, it is impossible for me to justify the Legislative Body, or to descry either its usual humanity or its usual knowledge. What! talk of bells? It is true, indeed, that they passed no law for restoring them; it is true, that no debate took place on the subject; it is true, that all they did was to hear a reporter propose their restoration, amidst a variety of other regulations; and it is farther true, that, in some subsequent speeches, certain orators of our party spoke with courage and philosophy against this institution of bells; but it must be admitted, that the Council did listen patiently for the space of four minutes to a reporter who proposed them; that they did not rise up in a body, from that impulse of virtuous indignation which seized on the philosopher Baillet, and forced him out of the Assembly; and that they did not call the orator to order, nor pass a vote of censure upon him:—this is enough, they cannot be excused; what! not perceive, at the first glance, all the consequences of these bells! not to have immediately felt the force of this truth—that to allow all religions indiscriminately to make use of bells, was infallibly to establish the preponderance of the Catholic Religion, which was already in possession of the largest; to make it the established religion, even the persecuting religion, to bring about the Counter-revolution, to massacre all the Republicans, to shed torrents of blood, and all by the wonderful virtue of bells! Not to have been aware, at least, of the ridiculous extreme into which every Legislator would have fallen, because, by the very act of granting this fatal

What ! because we had repealed one of the most monstrous laws which revolutionary rage and revolutionary absurdity had ever engendered, a law evi-

tal permission to all religions, they would have formally declared themselves to be Catholic, Apostolic and Roman, have proved that they made all the essence and glory of that religion consist in bells ; have revived, with them, all the abolished superstitions, have suddenly retrograded towards the darkness of the twelfth century, and have transformed the Council into a synod of Monks ? Such, again, is the efficacy of bells ! And, in short, if several of these disastrous consequences had not seemed infallible ; if they had retained, for instance, some hope of reconciling the restoration of the bells with the existence of the Republic and the perfect safety of Republicans, was it not enough that it excited the apprehensions of a small number of pure and energetic patriots, that the sound of bells raised some troublesome sensations in their minds, and that the repose of their fine souls was sometimes disturbed by it in the dead of night, to deter a legislative body, established for the sole purpose of promoting the happiness of those brave citizens, from thinking, even for a moment, of gratifying, at the expence of their rest, the wishes of all the inhabitants of the country, who anxiously solicited the restoration of their bells, and already began to use them, in anticipation of the law ? Such was the fault of the Legislative Body, which, you see, I expose with candour, without any attempt to diminish or to justify it.

But if the Council were so criminal, for only listening to the orator, what must we think of the orator himself ? And how could he excuse himself in the eyes of those who accuse his colleagues ? I must, however, be allowed candidly to observe, that I was less criminal than I was generally supposed to be ; I was far from perceiving, at that period, all that I have since discovered in his bells. Unenlightened, as Chénier very justly observed in one of his sublime speeches, in which he said, *stupid schoolboys talked to us of bells, and of the follies of their fathers* ; — I had brought with me, from my Department, a tender, but innocent affection for bells ; I was desirous of restoring them throughout the country, but without doing an injury to any one ; and I shuddered with horror myself, when, on reading the judicious observations of our armies upon bells, and another fine production of the Invalids, in which the question was scientifically discussed, I learnt into what a gulph of calamities the bells must infallibly have plunged us.

dently

dently corrupt in its nature, destructive in its effects, obnoxious in its penalties, already abolished by subsequent laws, already condemned by all the principles of the Constitution<sup>14</sup> ! Because we had restored to the country a number of her children, banished for their rejection of I know not what ecclesiastical discipline which they had not been commanded to admit, for having obeyed the law of their conscience, without violating the law of the State ! Because we had restored to all families relations whose absence they deplored ; to the people, pastors whose benedictions they invoked ; to morality, ministers whose duty it was to extend her empire !—Have you forgotten, then, that when that law with which you now reproach us, was put to the vote in the Assembly, you yourselves rose with us to express your approbation of it ?—so just it was, and so imperiously called for by the will of the nation ! Have you forgotten that its speedy adoption was advised by that same Boullay who is now one of your most staunch friends, and the worthy reporter of the 4th of September ; by that Boullay, who, discovering with wonderful penetration, the secret of our plots in the system of our laws, now maintains, that we considered the return of the Catholic Priests as our secret means of effecting a Counter-revolution<sup>15</sup>, and who then affirmed that the recall of the exiled Ecclesiastics was a just and humane measure that could no longer be deferred !

Lastly,

<sup>14</sup> The law respecting the recal of exiled priests.

<sup>15</sup> See the long speech delivered in the tribune, by Boullay de la Merthe, on the 3d of September.



Lastly, if it were true, as they asserted, that among those men whom our laws recalled, there were some whose minds were soured and prejudiced, what means so sure of reconciling them to their country, as to restore them to its bosom; of curing their prejudices, as to shew them our laws; of calming their resentment, as to soften their misfortunes? I appeal to those who are acquainted with the affections of nature. If a man can ever lose the desire of revenge, must it not be on the day when he sets foot on his native land, and pressing in his arms all that was dear to him, feels his heart open to happiness, and shut against hatred?

Yet all these eternal declamations on the return of the Priests and Emigrants, amount to nothing more than this; such are the violations of the Constitution with which they have not blushed to reproach us. People of France! you who alone have the right to judge the labours of your Representatives, you who will conscientiously decide between them and us, and will one day make them hear your dreadful sentence, we rejoice to have it in our power to boast of those same acts which our ferocious enemies have transformed into crimes. With confidence we lay open before you the picture of our short legislature; and we presume to think that as we often recur to your memory, you will be induced to say, in secret; "they were beneficent and  
 " just. The days of their reign were short, but  
 " they were marked by good actions. They pass-  
 " ed but few new laws, but they abolished many  
 " old ones that were disastrous. They threw open  
 " our

“ our temples, and caused unjust proscriptions to  
 “ cease ; they cast a paternal look on our colonies ;  
 “ they restored to thousands of citizens the proper-  
 “ ty and the rights of which tyranny had despoiled  
 “ them <sup>16</sup> ; a number of unfortunate men who were  
 “ shipwrecked on our coasts invoked their pity and  
 “ found them alive to compassion ; from every part  
 “ of France the voice of innocence and misfortune  
 “ resounded in the sanctuary of the laws, and the  
 “ dawn of justice opened upon this desolated land.”

By the observance of this beneficent conduct we  
 not only adhered literally to the Constitution, but  
 adopted the surest means of making it beloved.  
 And what homage more magnificent was ever  
 paid to it ? What more could its most ardent  
 friends do to promote its triumph than thus to  
 tear from it the blood-stained veil with which pas-  
 sion had covered it, and to present it to France in  
 its native colours, surrounded by the amiable re-  
 tinue of peace and justice ? And yet such con-  
 duct appeared to them to be a royal conspiracy !  
 Absurd men ! they are the same persons who told  
 you, that *royalism* engendered the system of terror,  
 in order, by that means, to render the Republic  
 intolerable to the people <sup>17</sup> : and when we poured  
 a healing balm on the wounds which that monster  
 had inflicted on the country ; when we dried up  
 the tears of so many unhappy victims ; when we

<sup>16</sup> The law on domains ; the law respecting the relations of  
 Emigrants ; the law on the members of the families of Bour-  
 bon, Orleans, &c.

<sup>17</sup> See Boullay's Speech already quoted.

extinguished the torch of hatred ; still it was *royalism* that acted and commanded ! Thus *royalism* does and undoes ; it is charged with committing revolutionary excesses, and accused of repairing them ; and this wretched phantom is incessantly at their command, in order to spread consternation among a people on whom they incessantly impose.

Gods ! if you were in earnest, if you had any sincere esteem for that Constitution, whose defenders you pronounce yourselves to be, how ought you to bless and encourage us ? Yes, if republican institutions could ever be realized in this vast empire, if an imperfect Constitution could ever be tolerated by a restless nation, it must certainly have been under our paternal authority. “ At length,”—it might be said,—“ they have destroyed those prejudices which combined, in the opinion of numbers, the idea of liberty with that of the most intolerable licentiousness. At length, they have revealed to the people this grand truth, hitherto unknown, that republican laws are not incompatible with equitable laws ; that the Republic is not *the infallible symbol of spoliation, oppression, and murder*. At length, universally substituting confidence for fear, as a means of commanding obedience, they began to give to our institutions that stamp of morality and wisdom, which can alone deserve the love of the French and the respect of all other nations.”



And if, by pursuing this line of conduct; if by realizing the greatest blessings of that Constitution; if, by ceasing to bend the necks of Frenchmen beneath a yoke of iron, it was still true, as you assert, that we prepared the fall of the Constitution and the destruction of the Republic, what answer do you expect me to make? What, in this case, would it have been but the invincible course of the nature of things, the irresistible bent of the national will, the astonishing demonstration that these institutions were only supported by fanaticism and terror? Should we, then, have been responsible for the consequences? Should we have dared, even while we deplored that will, to suspend its progress by violence? Would you, yourselves, dare to do this? And, with what face, Wretches, can you reproach us for not HAVING RENDERED THE PEOPLE SLAVES IN ORDER TO KEEP THEM REPUBLICANS, FOR NOT HAVING SACRIFICED A NATION TO AN INSTITUTION? And what should we have done, in that case, by adopting the restrictive system which you recommend, but support one crime by another, and commit at once the two-fold offence of KEEPING FRANCE IN A SITUATION WHICH SHE ABHORS, AND OF EMPLOYING, FOR THAT PURPOSE, THE MEANS OF THE MOST EXECRABLE TYRANNY? It is thus that those men, who accuse us of having destroyed the Constitution, of having paved the way for the restoration of royalty, commit the grossest outrage themselves on that Constitution

stitution which they love, on that Constitution which they extol. They undertake to proclaim to the nation, that to be just is to be counter-revolutionary; and that to restore the people to themselves is to restore monarchy.

After reproaching us with our actions, they next reproach us with our inactivity. "The second criminal feature of our legislative conduct is the having, at least indirectly, sapped the buttresses by which the Constitution is supported. The Government executes the Constitution; the Armies serve to defend it; and we neglected the Armies, and impeded the progress of Government."

Yes, to hear them talk, one should suppose that their armies had no longer any share in the affections and operations of the Legislative Body; that we did nothing for their glory, and forgot their dearest interests; that priests and emigrants were the sole objects of our solicitude. I might doubtless content myself with putting one plain question to these men:—You who governed in concert with us, you who dare to accuse your colleagues, what did your ardent zeal for the armies suggest better than what we did ourselves? What laws, what measures did you propose that we rejected, or even combated? If we neglected the armies, you neglected them also; you sanctioned our forgetfulness by your criminal silence; and what right have our accomplices to become our accusers?

But these calumnious reproaches must be investigated. We did nothing for the glory of the

F

armies!

armies! What does this mean? No doubt that the Legislative Body had, in preceding sessions, often proclaimed, that they had deserved well of their country; and that, in the last session, no such proclamation was made. This is true; but were not the laws in question always the result of some victory? And did not the armistice, which lasted during the whole of our session, prevent us from having any victory to celebrate? For what purpose should we have made our hall resound with acclamations, which can only be produced by some recent success? Ought not the soldiers to have been satisfied with the recollection, that most of us had, at other periods, not only concurred in, but actually proposed, such measures; and that they carefully seized every opportunity that occurred, in their speeches, for recalling and praising their immortal triumphs? Ought they not to have perceived, that when generals, who were members of the Legislative Body, were so honourably distinguished by us; when we raised, by acclamation, to the dignity of president, that Pichegru, who was then only known by his victories; when we promoted a Willot, a Villaret-Joyeuse to the office of Secretary to the Assembly, we meant to do honour to their military achievements as much as to their civic virtues, and paid homage in their persons to the whole army?

We forgot their interests! What again does this mean? No doubt that our soldiers suffered every species of privation, and that we neglected to relieve them. I begin by positively denying, that



that any such distress did, in fact, exist. There were some partial wants experienced; but nothing like what was represented. Perfidy alone could be guilty of such gross exaggeration. All those reports are contradicted by incontestible proofs, as well as by the most simple argument. Who can be made to believe, that three or four hundred thousand men, a part of whom were living in an enemy's country, whose expences must, in virtue of existing laws, be first defrayed, could not receive, out of the whole mass of the direct or indirect contributions levied in France, and of those levied in foreign countries, sufficient, even after the most enormous dilapidations, for their own subsistence? Besides, what was it our duty to do that we did not do? Did we not enforce all the laws which declared their expences to be *privileged*? Did we not leave, at different periods, sufficient sums for the purpose at the disposal of Government? Was not Government authorised to apply them immediately to the pay of the troops? And if, notwithstanding these efforts of our paternal solicitude, they still suffered and complained; to whom was the fault to be imputed? Was it not solely imputable to that Directory, *who were surprised in introducing a concerted disorder into the military fund, suspending indispensable payments, which they were ordered and empowered to make, and endeavouring to provoke the resentment of the troops against us by the distress which they made them suffer*: to that Directory who dissipated all the sums that were entrusted to them by the most

faithless management, and by the most ruinous contracts? Nay, did not all France resound with the negotiations entered into with the company of Godart, Gaillard, and Dijon; and with the dilapidations committed in Italy by Flachat and his associates<sup>18</sup>? Have not all the armies been witnesses to the voracious rapacity of the contractors, to their rapid fortunes, to their insolent luxury? That, that is the gulph which has swallowed up all the treasures that were destined for the relief of the troops! And these Directors, whose greedy hands were employed to dig it, ought to be called to a dreadful account for their conduct. Lastly, it is equally true, that a part of those evils of which the army complained, was a deplorable but necessary consequence of the general situation of France. The troops suffered! And who was there in the country that did not suffer? DID NOT THE FARMER GROAN BENEATH THE WEIGHT OF PUBLIC TAXES? DID NOT THE MERCHANT DEPLORE A SCANTY SPECIE, AN ANNIHILATED CREDIT, AND DESERTED MANUFACTORIES? WERE NOT THOUSANDS OF INDIVIDUALS, WHO HAD TASTED THE SWEETS OF FORTUNE, PLUNGED IN THE HORRORS OF IN-

<sup>18</sup> It is well known, that one of our first magistrates was deeply interested in these transactions.—*Author.*

Camille Jordan might have added, what I am enabled, from authentic information, to advance as a fact, that not only the lawyer Rewbell, but his brother Directors, the prince of profligates, Barras, and the sneaking, spiritless, irresolute, *ben-pecked* La Reveillere Lépaux, with the *immaculate* Tallien and Merlin de Thionville, were all interested in these infamous dilapidations, and are even now concerned with the contractors for the Army of England.—*Translator.*

DIGENCE?

DIGENCE? Were we then expected to perform impossibilities? Was the soldier to be astonished that he should participate, in some degree, the general fate of his countrymen? Could he require that we should carry the misery of so many thousand families to the utmost height, in order to add to his ease? Had he any right to complain, because, in the midst of such a multitude of irremediable evils, we bestowed all the consolation in our power; performed acts of humanity which cost nothing to any one; and, unable to pour treasures upon France, filled it with beneficent laws?

And if it were necessary to trace these public calamities, of which our soldiers felt, in a small degree, the effects, to their true origin, would not you, who stand forward as our accusers, have something to answer for in your turn? Are you not sensible that many weighty complaints would fall upon your heads? Who ravaged this beautiful empire during three years? Who dried up all the sources of its prosperity? Who unpeopled the workshops? Who ruined the manufactories? Who caused the specie to disappear? Who destroyed trade by vexatious laws? Who forced the national industry to seek an asylum in a foreign land? Who overthrew all the institutions of beneficence? Had none of you any share in this system of devastation? Did none of you traverse France to enforce the execution of its atrocious regulations? Did none of you shew yourselves to your fellow-citizens, gorged with riches acquired by these detestable means? How



many could I point out, whose recent and monstrous fortunes scandalously insult the public misery? It is curious to hear these men, wallowing, as they are in opulence and luxury, compassionate the soldiers whom they despise, and reproach us with the evils of which they are themselves the authors.

We did not think it sufficient to provide, as far as circumstances would permit, for the pay of the armies; we directed our attention to their other wants. There was a committee expressly charged with devising means for securing the milliard<sup>19</sup> promised to be paid them at the peace. There was another, composed wholly of military men, employed in preparing useful reforms of all kinds. Their reports had already occupied a great number of our sittings. At their request we had established a military code, which reconciled the duties of discipline with the rights of liberty; and settled a mode of retirement, which ensured to every one the reward of his services, while it released him from the caprice of authority.

And let me ask, was it only by acts relating to the armies exclusively, that we endeavoured to promote the interest and the glory of the troops? Did we not labour efficaciously to promote their glory, when we rendered that liberty, whose heroes they were, respectable by virtue; when we gave to

<sup>19</sup> By a former decree of the Convention, a milliard, or national property to the amount of a thousand million of livres, (upwards of forty-two millions sterling,) was secured to the army at the conclusion of a general peace.—*Translator.*

that

that Constitution which they defended, a brilliancy of justice and wisdom by which it had never been distinguished before? Did we not promote their dearest interests, when we prepared the domestic happiness of France? when we restored to their families ease, morality, and order? when we prepared for them, at their return, the spectacle of a well-regulated empire, and a portion of the general felicity? And what more noble mode of at once honouring and rewarding citizen-soldiers could be adopted, than that of making good laws for the country which they inhabit and which they cherish.

It is true, indeed, that, in the midst of so many blessings, we complained that a column of troops had dared to pass the limits prescribed by the Constitution. It is true, that we prepared a law for repressing the deliberations and addresses of the armies. It is true, that we ordered all the half-pay officers to go and receive the pay that was due to them in their respective departments; and, by so doing, we are told, that we displayed an injurious mistrust of French soldiers, and seemed to dread their presence, and to suspect their patriotism. But what legislator, possessed of common sense, was ever restrained from the discharge of his duty by considerations of this nature? What! by making laws for the prosecution of crimes, we insult the men to whom those laws are addressed? What! it was also an insult to French citizens to enact penalties against popular seditions? What good man was ever enraged at being deprived of

the means of doing evil? Do our soldiers then all pretend, not only that their opinions are infallible, but that their conduct is irreproachable? Can we not give them credit for their patriotism, yet foresee and dread its excesses? Let us lay all vain flattery aside, and speak the language of austere truth. Our armies are no doubt distinguished for their attachment and their zeal; but to what seductions are they not exposed? How many just grounds for alarm do they afford to the enlightened friends of liberty and order? Is not their constitution itself calculated to inspire such apprehensions? Who is not aware, that soldiers, torn from the bosom of their country, removed to a distance from the theatre of public affairs, preserving no direct communication with the representatives of the nation, solely dependent on the Directory, who give them such leaders as they approve, who send them what journals they like, who surround them with their emissaries, cannot possibly receive any correct information on the state of their country, or of the parties which it contains? Who is not aware that, even if they receive such information, their minds are so occupied by other objects, that they cannot attend to it? Who is not aware that, if they do attend to it, they are incessantly brought back, by the mere habits of military discipline, to a blind obedience to their leaders, or hurried on, by that ardent enthusiasm which animates them in the field, to all those audacious enterprizes which the spirit of faction and revolt suggests: and that,

lastly,



lastly, the brilliant qualities of the hero are scarcely compatible with the peaceful virtues of the citizen.

Is not the sad experience of the past calculated to encrease these fears ? Ought not the numerous excesses which have been committed by soldiers, seduced and misled, to be ever present to our minds ? *Who, on the 31st of May<sup>20</sup>, was the hope and the support of the most execrable tyrants ?* The SOLDIERS. *Who lent their arms in order to bend an indignant nation beneath a yoke of iron ?* The SOLDIERS. *Who came to combat, under your walls, O ! my fellow-citizens, the last sublime efforts of expiring Liberty ; to burn your habitations ; to massacre your youth ; to preside over the most ferocious executions ; to attack, with their swords, those unfortunate men who had escaped from their cannon ?* The SOLDIERS. *Who, in every other part of France, made torrents of French blood to flow amidst repeated acclamations of Liberty for ever ?* The SOLDIERS. *Who, even after the 9th of Thermidor<sup>21</sup>, when humanity was awakened in every heart, again returned, at the very first signal, to their old habits of carnage, and, answering the just claims of a free people by discharges of cannon, again spread consternation and death through the streets of Paris<sup>22</sup> ?* The

<sup>20</sup> The period at which the overthrow of the Brissotin party was effected.—*Translator.*

<sup>21</sup> When Robespierre and the Terrorists were destroyed.—*Translator.*

<sup>22</sup> On the establishment of the *last new* Constitution, in the Autumn of 1795, when the troops were employed, under the direction of Barras, to murder the Parisians for presuming to assert their right to choose their own representatives ; a right secured to them by that Constitution.—See *Danican's Memoirs.*—*Translator.*

**SOLDIERS.** But what soldiers? A few individuals perhaps? No; whole battalions. They were deceived you will say; I hope they were; but be that as it may, were not men, who had suffered themselves to be so far misled as to stifle all the affections of nature, and to commit the most horrible crimes<sup>23</sup>, likely to be seduced to violate the principles of the Constitution, and to direct their arms against the Legislative Authority?

Besides, were we at liberty to render this natural mistrust the subject of debate? Had we, on this head, any new law to make? Had not every thing been foreseen and settled beforehand by the Constitution itself? Is it not the Constitution that deprives the troops of the exercise of their political rights; that forbids them to deliberate; that prohibits them from approaching the seat of the National Representation? It admitted the supposition, then, that the armies might be seduced; it dreaded their political influence; it wished to reduce them to a state of passive obedience. We, then, did no more than execute the Constitution, without judging of its propriety. Its authors might, if you please, have committed an error, but we only discharged a duty.

Observe how much a cause so just permits us to concede. Even were it true that we had, in

<sup>23</sup> And yet these are the very men on whom the *humane*, the *benevolent*, the *patriotic* GILBERT WAKEFIELD has bestowed the most fulsome adulation; calling them "*unconquerable heroes*;"—"the most strenuous and invariable supporters of *Republicanism*;"—"an adequate and fair representative of the whole community of France!!!" Oh! shame, where is thy blush?  
—Translator.

fact, neglected so much the interests of the army, evinced a dread injurious to the troops, and committed some fault in this respect, still what a difference is there between such conduct and a royal conspiracy ! What a chain of proofs are still wanting to establish the existence of the plot of which we have been accused ! Is there no medium between a neglect of the army and a wish to destroy it ? between a dread of the approach of the troops, and a project for erecting a throne ? Nay, if we had really conspired, if we had really resolved to oppress the nation, would not policy have dictated the prudence of adopting a line of conduct diametrically opposite to that which we actually pursued ? Would not the troops have been the object of our constant solicitude ? Should we not have made every attempt to attach them to our cause, by the seduction of praise and the lure of interest ? Should we, on the contrary, have laboured to irritate them by contempt and neglect ? Was it not sufficiently obvious, that their resentment would form the most insurmountable obstacle to the completion of our designs, as their attachment would afford the best means of encouragement and the surest pledge of success ?

This mode of reasoning upon facts leads to the establishment of an important truth, of which our accusers are perfectly sensible. In stating what we should have done, I relate what they did themselves.—And this is the true, the only origin of the reproach which they prefer against us. They wanted the assistance of the army, because the people were  
not



not with them ; and in order to secure that, it was necessary to tell the troops that we were their enemies. By this means, they reaped the double advantage of displaying an hypocritical tenderness for them, and of exciting their resentment against us. It was of little consequence to them that this system of defamation was wholly destitute of support ; it was sufficient for their purpose, that their calumnious declamations should resound in the ears of the soldiers. They knew that there would be nobody there to contradict them ; they knew that those ardent souls would easily become dupes to the imposition, and that the more it tended to irritate their minds, the more readily would they be convinced of its truth. Thus their accusation itself bespoke our innocence, and betrayed all their own crimes.

Soldiers ! listen to the advice of one of those men whom you perhaps believe to be your enemies, because you have been ordered to believe it ; but to whom your true interests are dearer than to all those men who thus address you in the degrading language of base adulation. Remember, that, under Robespierre, the support of your bayonets was also bought by vain commendations, and your triumphs celebrated with *eclat*, in order to secure, in return, your approbation of acts of the most ferocious despotism. Recognise, in the same speeches, the same designs. Be assured that, in a Republic, all flatterers of the armies are oppressors of the people ; be persuaded, that the only fruit you can reap in the new path which you have been made to pursue, is disgrace, infamy,

infamy, and wretchedness; and see Europe, which began to admire you, still less for the splendour of your victories than for the dignity of your cause and the magnanimity of your motives, already asking how valiant soldiers could become the blind instruments of oppression to their country, and how they could consent to exchange the honourable titles of Defenders of Liberty and Guardians of the People and their Representatives, for that of Satellites to a Directory, and Prætorian Guards to the vilest of Tyrants<sup>24</sup>. See your fellow-citizens, who had prepared

<sup>24</sup> It would be difficult to reconcile the pompous titles which Camille Jordan here bestows on the troops, with the account he has just given of their conduct. I shall leave others to discover the *dignity* of that cause which had for its object the oppression of France and the subjection of neighbouring States; and the *magnanimity* of those motives which could influence men to engage in so detestable an enterprise; and content myself with asking, with what propriety those men can be called the "*Defenders of Liberty*," whom the author has proved to have been, through every stage of the Revolution, the servile pandars of despotism: and the appellation of *Guardians of the People and of their Representatives*, be conferred on those who have been proved to be ready, on all occasions, to enslave and even massacre the former, and to intimidate, insult, and overawe the latter? The troops are only acting the same part now with the Directory, which they formerly acted with the Executive Council, and the Committee of Public Safety; and, at a subsequent period, with Barras, Tallien, and their associates. As to the admiration which it is here said Europe began to display, I apprehend, it was confined to those parts of Europe which are either subjected to the terror of French arms, or to the influence of French principles. By all the sound, rational, and moral parts of Europe, the conduct of the Republican troops, whose profligate depredations have not been equalled since the irruption of the Goths and Vandals, and who have consequently aggravated the horrors of war beyond all example, has, I believe, excited no sentiments but those of horror, indignation, and disgust. As to their boasted valour, that is a point which I shall reserve for discussion in a future publication;

prepared to receive you with such marks of joy and gratitude, now indignantly call upon you to restore their violated Constitution, complain that you profited by your services to attack their most sacred rights, and, dreading still greater evils from the audacity with which victory has inspired you, *as much alarmed at the prospect of peace as at the continuance of war.* Soldiers, Soldiers, there is still time enough for reform; become Citizens again, and the country is saved, and, with it, your glory.

The last accusation preferred against us, is that we impeded the progress of Government; that is to say, of the Directory.

In the first place, let them show that it would, in fact, have been so great a crime to interpose some obstacles to that still new power in a free nation; and that prudence did not dictate the necessity of preventing, at its very outset, the full display of its strength. Let them shew, that the men who formed the majority of the Directory ought, either by their past conduct or their present interests, to have inspired us with a blind confidence in the exercise of so formidable an authority. *Great Gods! could we forget the impure source whence four of them issued? Could we forget, that the canon of*

publication; premising only, in this place, that were it ten times greater than it is actually said to be, that man must be a dastard, and have not one spark of British spirit in his soul, who would dread to meet them "hand to hand." It is certainly imprudent, on the one hand, to treat an enemy with too much contempt; but it is assuredly much more imprudent (to say no worse of it) on the other hand, to magnify his prowess, and absurdly represent him as invincible.—*Translator.*

*Vendemiaire*



*Vendemiaire had opened for them the road to the supreme power? Could we forget that they were indebted for their places to the most scandalous intrigue? Did not the bare sight of these men awaken a thousand confused sentiments of horror and alarm? And who would not have trembled to see the fate of France confided to hands that were dyed with French blood? Was the first trial which they made of their power calculated to dispel these apprehensions? And what were we to think of their election of commissaries from the very dregs of a corrupted people; of their dismissal of administrators cherished by the citizens who had elected them; and of their conduct in sending odious proconsuls into the South of France, to revive, among you, my fellow-citizens, the revolutionary government; and in suddenly depriving the western Departments of the blessings of peace; and in violating that faith which had been solemnly pledged to their inhabitants? Did instances of wickedness or ignorance, which history will find it difficult to enumerate, form such respectable claims to a confidence which it would have been scarcely prudent to grant to the purest and most virtuous of men?*

But what were, in point of fact, those troublesome restrictions which we had imposed upon them? What was that state of weakness and impotence to which we had reduced their authority? Listen, People of France! and judge of the extent of that ambition which could not be satisfied with such immense power. They had the entire disposal of all our forces by land and sea; they directed, both at home and abroad, all the movements of martial

and powerful armies; they exercised an absolute sway over our colonies; they had the exclusive privilege of treating with foreign powers; they alone regulated the employment of the public revenue; they nominated to all military posts, and to all places under Government; they had it in their power to surmise, depose, and replace, at their pleasure, the administrations chosen by the people; they were surrounded with all the pomp of representation, and with all the splendour of honours. Well, to these extraordinary attributes which had been assigned them by the Constitution, notwithstanding the remonstrances that were made from every quarter, notwithstanding the incompatibility of the concession itself with the Constitution, we had suffered them to add the right of deciding, definitively, on the erasure of names from the lists of Emigrants, that of enlarging those fatal lists, by the means of administrators chosen by themselves; that is to say, a power of life and death over all persons; a right of spoliation over all families; the opportunity of corrupting and intimidating all men, by the influence of hope or the operation of fear. Not satisfied with having thus put the persons of all other Frenchmen, we had farther put our own persons, in their power; we suffered, in the very place of our residence, a numerous corps of Janissaries, under their command; while we kept for our own guard a mere handful of mercenaries not chosen by ourselves. Gods! we had left them in possession of such an alarming force, that they had only to signify their will in order

order to effect the destruction of our authority; only to command; in order to atchieve, the dissolution of the national representation; and yet they dare to complain! As if, for enforcing the execution of the laws, it was not sufficient to be entrusted with a power capable of overturning all laws! Alas! is this a malignant derision of our good faith? Are these the cruel insults of the conqueror?

It is true, indeed, that, of this multitude of prerogatives which had been granted them with so much facility by a legislature that was the work of their own hands, and the majority of which perpetuated their own power, by enlarging that of their patrons, we had taken the liberty, within the last few months, of retrenching several. We had deprived them of the power of putting towns in a state of siege at their pleasure; that of dismissing military officers in an arbitrary manner; and that of opening all letters whatever; and we even talked of subjecting their agents to a more rigid responsibility.

These were, no doubt, very heinous offences! It was a heinous offence to prevent three Directors from depriving our towns, at their will, of all the forms of liberty; from governing them by Generals; and exercising such a military despotism as our Monarchs had never attempted to exercise. It was a heinous offence to insist, that merit should be encouraged and respected in our armies, and that brave warriors should not lose, by capricious dismissals, the reward of their glorious services!

G

It



It was a heinous offence to prevent vile commissaries from seizing the private letters of citizens, and casting their profane looks over the secrets of families, and the effusions of friendship ! It was a heinous offence to desire that agents, charged with enforcing the execution of the laws, should be made responsible for the abuse of their power to others than a Directory who would certainly take special care not to denounce men who were nothing more than their own creatures or accomplices !

It is also true, that we compelled the Directory to recall the commissaries which they had sent to the colonies. We certainly ought to have left them in possession of an authority of which they made so noble an use ! We ought to have waited until the total ruin of the Antilles had been completed ! The Representatives of the Nation ought to have contemplated devastation, murder, and conflagration with a tranquil eye, and, so long as the Directory, apprised of these disorders, did not think it expedient to stop their progress, to have forbore to exercise their own constitutional prerogative in putting an end to them ! Alas ! who knows, but that a just posterity, on looking back to the scenes of desolation which have so long continued in these unfortunate countries, knowing that they passed with the knowledge and under the protection of that Directorial authority, will feel surprised and indignant at us, because the moment we were informed of the facts, instead of limiting our attempts to an useless change of commissaries, in-

stead

stead of entrusting the reparation of the excesses to the very men who had tolerated them all, we did not seize them in a transport of holy wrath, and drag them from the throne which they polluted, in order to give them up to the vengeance of the Tribunals, and devote them to the execration of the whole human race!

Lastly, it is true, that we did not satisfy the insatiable cupidity of our Directors; and this constituted our grand, our unpardonable crime. They were only allowed to squander away, in *the space of eighteen months*, ELEVEN HUNDRED MILLIONS IN SPECIE<sup>25</sup>, as was proved by calculations in the Council of Elders; and, for some time past, incessantly occupied with devising means of restoring order to our finances, reduced to the alternative of increasing the receipts or diminishing the expenditure, of adding to the mass of imposts already excessive, or of enforcing the most rigid economy in every department of the state, we did not hesitate in our choice; we spared reviving industry, attacked inveterate abuses, carried order into the very bosom of chaos; we took from the Directory the arbitrary disposal of the public money; we wished to interdict those senseless negotiations, and those ruinous anticipations by means of which they contrived to devour both our present wealth and our future resources; we made them lose all hopes of extorting from us those indirect imposts which they were solicitous to

<sup>25</sup> Upwards of forty-eight millions sterling, reckoning the French livre at 10½d. English money.—*Translator*.

establish for the twofold purpose of dissipating the money, and calumniating us; in a word, we preferred that system which was most beneficial to the People, to that which would have been most convenient to the Directory. Such a reform was, beyond all doubt, a crime. Thence, as from an empoisoned spring, issued that torrent of calumny which they showered upon us; those reproaches of having suffered the service to languish, at a time when they interrupted its progress themselves; of having increased the wretchedness of the creditors of the nation, at a time *when they were interested in the fall of our funds*<sup>26</sup>, and the depreciation of our credit. Hence it was, that every species of calumny was followed by every species of threat; and that those threats were succeeded by acts of violence;—our royal conspiracy was nothing more than their fiscal conspiracy; they had exhausted the Treasury by their profusion, and they were resolved to replenish it by their crimes.

Trace the subsequent conduct of these new Administrators, in this same career. See what the public fortune, and the fortunes of individuals have become in their hands. The people groaned be-

<sup>26</sup> Those virtuous Directors, Citizen-Kings Rewbell, Merlin, Barras, and La Reveillere Lepaux, have gained thousands by the fall of the French funds, that is to say, of the different species of property, if such it may be called, that constitute the sole security of the starving creditors of the French Republic.—And they still continue this dishonourable traffic, with the assistance of Ramel, who, on that account, has been suffered to retain his situation under government, while his relation of the same name, who was Commandant of the Guard of the Council, has been transported.—*Translator.*



neath the weight of their old burdens, and they crush them with new ones;—they re-establish those indirect imposts the very name of which was odious to the people, and the re-establishment of which seemed to exceed the limits of our power. Among the number, they place that tax upon lotteries which virtuous Legislators avoided on account of its profound immorality, and which enlightened Financiers ought to shun, from the vices inseparable from its collection. They rob the wretched creditor of the State of his last resource—Hope; and they affect to pay his demand by giving him depreciated securities (*Bons*) that represent but a small portion of his debt, which only ensure him a species of property of which it is scarcely possible that he can avail himself, and which he cannot even employ for the payment of his own creditors. By this means their conduct affects not only the unhappy object himself, but a number of citizens who are connected with him; by this means a *general bankruptcy prevails throughout France*; and already, since the 4th of September, *inscriptions still farther depreciated; the course of exchange still more and more against us; a weakened credit; an impeded circulation; and discouraged industry*, attest to Europe the confidence of France in her new Governors, and pronounce, at once, the severest satire upon their administration, and the most unequivocal eulogy upon ours.

I come, at length, to the last, to the most weighty, to the most perfidious of their reproaches. The

Directory accuse us of having thrown obstacles in the way of their negotiation for peace!—Peace!—Woe unto us if we had really contributed to prolong that horrible effusion of human blood with which Europe has been afflicted for five years. But where are the proofs of this atrocious imputation? What negotiations did we obstruct? What negotiations were even known to us? When did the Directory, who have alone the power to open and to conclude them, deign, during so long a space of time, to make one single communication to us on the subject of our situation in respect of the belligerent powers? Who could say, while they observed a profound silence, whether some admissible propositions had not been made to them, and whether they did not meet them with exorbitant pretensions? Does not the mystery which they affect turn every presumption against them? And if, in fact, some part of their deliberations has transpired, what do we learn from it? *Which of them wished for peace, or strove to accelerate its conclusion? Who, by his energetic resistance, prevented the signal for battle from being given anew, three months ago?* Barthelemy and Carnot; that is to say, those men who are supposed to be our accomplices, and who certainly, on this important point, adopted our wishes, and favoured our designs.

We obstructed peace! Was it our interest, then, or was it theirs to prolong the war? *Was not peace the surest means of weakening their authority, and war the surest means of augmenting their power?*

Is

Is it not in time of war, that, by the direction of powerful armies, by the possession of immense treasures, by the disposal of numberless places, and by the splendour of victory, an executive power may acquire and confirm a fatal preponderance<sup>27</sup>? While they knew so well this secret of their strength, could it escape our notice? And what a contradiction would it have been, on our part, to combat their power, and at the same time to remove its best check!

Peace! Which of us laboured most efficaciously to promote it from our disposition and by our conduct? WHAT WAS THE GRAND PRINCIPLE OF THE WAR, AND THE GRAND OBSTACLE TO PEACE? WERE THEY NOT OUR REVOLUTIONARY DOCTRINES, THAT MAD PROJECT OF DESTROYING ALL THRONES, OF OVERTHROWING ALL EMPIRES; THE IMMORALITY OF OUR GOVERNORS; AND THE INSTABILITY OF OUR GOVERNMENT? Who, then, opened the way to a general pacification—THAT DIRECTORY WHO ARE AS MUCH DESPISED IN EUROPE, AS THEY ARE ABHORRED IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY<sup>28</sup>; THAT DIRECTORY WHO WERE STILL IMBUED WITH REVOLUTIONARY MAXIMS, AND STILL BOUND BY SO MANY TIES TO THE FACTION WHICH PROFESSED

<sup>27</sup> It will be easily conceived, that the executive power does not stand in need of this resource, when, as at present, it unites, with the power of executing the laws, that of making them.

<sup>28</sup> It is needless to apprise the reader, that all that I say of the actions of the Directory applies only to the majority.



THEM ; THAT DIRECTORY, WHICH HAD VIOLATED THE FAITH OF TREATIES WITH THE AMERICANS <sup>29</sup>, AND OVERTURNED THE GOVERNMENTS OF VENICE AND GENOA ; AND SENT THEIR GENERALS TO INVADE, ON THE MOST FRIVOLOUS PRETENCES, THE TERRITORY OF NEUTRAL POWERS ;—or that Legislative Body whose moderate and conciliating spirit promised to give some solidity to our political institutions ; that Legislative Body which promulgated all liberal ideas, which announced a resolution of observing treaties in future, of respecting governments, and of preserving, in our political relations with all foreign powers, that character for good faith

<sup>29</sup> This acknowledged “ *violation of the faith of treaties with the Americans*,” stated by a French legislator who could not be ignorant of the fact, will, I should apprehend, suffice to settle the question, between the author of the very able “ *Observations on the Dispute between the United States and France*,” and his antagonist, as he has been improperly called, Mr. Monroe ; or rather between Mr. Harper and the anonymous editor of the mutilated edition of Mr. Monroe’s ponderous octavo, intitled, “ *A View of the Conduct of the Executive in the Foreign Affairs of the United States, as connected with the Mission to the French Republic*,” &c. It will demonstrate, at least, to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced minds, that “ *the pernicious misrepresentations—the errors—the poison—and the daily abuse*” of which the said editor so loudly complains, are no where to be found but in his own Preface. I will not repeat what I have heard, of Mr. Monroe’s connections with the French Directory, nor will I admit the supposition that his editor is equally attached to them ; but I must say, that those minds appear to me to be strangely formed, which can, by any considerations, be led to plead the cause of our insolent, unjust, and despotic enemy, against their own country, which they are bound, by every principle of duty, by every tie of moral rectitude, to defend !—Oh ! what would I give for a peep into the *Livre Rouge* of the regicidal Directory.—*Translator*.

and

and justice which could alone retain our friends and increase their number? *Alas! it was our crimes, our threats, which had forced so many nations to take up arms against us; and it was our virtues and our moderation that could alone induce them to lay them down.*

Peace! It was the subject of our invocations in all our speeches; it was the object of all our wishes. Perfidious men! They took care not to conclude it then; but they will be induced to conclude it now. They will make peace, to stop the mouths of an indignant nation; to conceal their own numerous crimes beneath the shade of one solitary blessing; to persuade the people that our presence formed the only obstacle to its conclusion; to surround themselves with the only supports of an usurped power, and to keep the citizens in awe by the troops. **THEY WILL MAKE PEACE; BUT BE ASSURED, IT WILL BE BUT TRANSITORY; AND, CONTINUING TO PROFESS ALL THE REVOLUTIONARY MAXIMS, AND INUNDATING ALL THE COUNTRIES IN ALLIANCE WITH FRANCE, WITH THEIR APOSTLES OF REBELLION, THEY WILL IN FACT FERTILIZE, UNDER THE SEMBLANCE OF PEACE, ALL THE GERMS OF A NEW AND MORE BLOODY WAR.** They will make peace, but be assured, it will be only a partial peace; and though the splendour of our victories, and the number of our conquests enabled them—if their only object had been to secure an honourable independence—to dictate peace to the world; you will see them, while they extinguish the flame of discord in one part of Europe, make it  
rage

rage with greater fury in another ; perhaps resume their senseless projects of conquering a rival nation, and again propose, to our exhausted armies, to the sad relics of our most flourishing youth, to go and shed torrents of blood on the coasts of England, for the greater glory of some General, for the greater convenience of some Director, and for all that filthy assemblage of low personal interests which they have been pleased to decorate with the sacred name of Country.

It was thus that we threw obstacles in the way of the government ; it was thus that we sometimes checked the effusions of their sensibility for the people ! Ah ! if they wish really to degrade us in the eyes of the people, instead of these delusive reproaches, why do they not accuse us of having believed them to be less perverse and less audacious than they really were ? Why do they not accuse us of having contributed, by our excessive confidence, to our own ruin ; of not having dared to commit most of the acts which they have laid to our charge ? Gods ! The Constitution, and the public opinion, afforded us so many means for confining that terrible power ! but we did not employ them. We might have passed a decree of accusation ; but we published a pardon. We might have roused the anger of the people ; but we proclaimed peace. We might have dismissed their troops ; but we did them the honour to believe that they were citizens. We might have prepared for attack ; but we did not even provide ourselves with the means of defence. They acted, while

we



we deliberated. They violated all principles; we suffered ourselves to be stopped by scruples. The fatal night had spread her veil of darkness; the deadly hour had stricken; they spoke, and we were annihilated—Ah! Too much confidence, too much candour;—that, that was our crime, our real error. People of France! We accuse ourselves before you. Pardon us for not having conspired to save, when your enemies were conspiring to destroy, you! Pardon us for not having sapped that colossal power which has despoiled you of your liberty! Pardon us for having opposed the most profound malice with nothing but the arms of good faith! Pardon us for having only been just when we ought to have been severe and terrible! Absolve us, absolve us, of the evils which they inflict, and for the evils which they are preparing for you . . . . .

But more especially before you, Lyonnese, before you, the most energetic of Frenchmen, does your Representative accuse himself of a deference which he believed to be a duty. He accuses himself of having checked the strong impulse which daily urged him to rush into the Tribune, and there to demand, in the name of the People of France, the signal punishment of the traitors. He accuses himself of too great a facility in believing that, in those times of trouble and tumult, it was the wisdom of age, rather than the audacity of youth, that ought to guide the helm and to avert the storm.

I might certainly be allowed to stop here, and to consider my task as completed. I have made that phantom vanish which our adversaries had conjured

up

up in order to mask their own crimes; I have shewn that it was neither supported by juridical proofs nor by moral inductions; that our dispositions, our conduct, and our actions, all attested the very absurdity of the accusation preferred; that thus nothing spoke in their favour, while every thing spoke in ours; and that they had accused, not merely without proofs, but against all proofs, and in the teeth of evidence the most clear and satisfactory.

To condemn them by justifying ourselves, would be sufficient to open the eyes of the most blind to the illegality of their proceedings, and to the nature of a power which seeks for support in the baseness of its calumny.

But though I may have said enough for that purpose, I am far from having said all that the cause admits of. I am far from having gone to the bottom of that frightful abyss of wickedness and imposture. Dismiss from your minds every thing that I have hitherto said. Forget, if it be possible, that we were innocent; believe, for an instant, all their fables, and let us see whether even the crimes which they ascribe to us can justify the attempts which they have made; whether they can supply the shadow of a pretext, or of an excuse for their conduct.

Such is, in fact, Oh Frenchmen! the extraordinary attack which your tyrants have made upon all principles; such the unexampled violation of all that is holden sacred among men, that their minds, all fertile as they are in the creation of calumny, could not invent one single imputation that could justify their conduct even to those who give

full credit to their assertions ; and that their audacious enterprise cannot acquire, I do not say from facts, but from their own black suppositions, a colour of legality.

“ A conspiracy (they say) was formed that tended  
 “ to destroy the Constitution, and to restore Monarchy. Its authors were members of the Legislative Body and of the Directory. They were  
 “ well known ; they might all have been convicted.” . . . Well ! had not the Constitution foreseen and provided for such an occurrence ? Had it not regulated the mode of proceeding, which must have been followed, if the preservation of that Constitution had been their object, if they had only paid obedience to its commands ? It had ordained, that we should be denounced, and had prescribed the form of the denunciation. It had enjoined that we should be made to appear, within a given time ; it had traced the forms to be observed for deciding whether there were sufficient grounds for a legal accusation ; it had particularly instituted tribunals for trying us<sup>30</sup>.

Did they discharge those duties ? Did they observe those forms ? Did they observe any one of them ? No ; but I will tell you what they did : while they omitted whatever the Constitution prescribed, they did what it absolutely forbade ; and, as if these first transgressions had not been sufficient, they committed others that were still more criminal.

<sup>30</sup> Read from the 110th to the 123d Articles ; and the 158th Article.



The Constitution gave to the Legislative Body a right of directing the police in the place of their sittings, and within a certain district around it<sup>31</sup>. The laws forbade the Directory, and all their agents, *under pain of death*, to introduce any armed force whatever into such place, or into such district<sup>32</sup>; to make any effort to prevent the meeting, or to effect the dissolution, of the Legislative Body; to restrain the freedom of their deliberations<sup>33</sup>; or to attack the personal liberty of any one of its members; and yet the Directory caused the garden of the Thuilleries, the halls of the two Councils, to be attacked and occupied by their troops in the night of the 4th of September; their Generals ordered members of the Legislature to be arrested; and the soldiers even laid violent hands on the very men who exercised, in the name of the Legislative Body, that right of police, which the Constitution had expressly assigned to them; and when the presidents and the members of the two Councils repaired at the usual hour to their respective halls, that impious soldiery threatened them with their bayonets: their persons were insulted, attacked in the very place where no authority but their own could be acknowledged; where no voice but their own could give orders.

The Constitution prohibited the sections of the Legislative Body from deliberating unless there were, at least, two hundred members

<sup>31</sup> Constitutional Act, Art. 62.    <sup>32</sup> Penal Code, Art. 622.

<sup>33</sup> Penal Code, Art. 620.

present in the Council of Five Hundred<sup>34</sup>; and one hundred and twenty-six in the Council of Elders<sup>35</sup>; and yet a few conspirators<sup>36</sup>, assembled privately and illegally, in apartments prepared for them by the Directory, who reserved to themselves the sole right of admission and exclusion; dared to call themselves *The Legislative Body*; surrounded themselves with the guard belonging to that Body, imitated its forms, counterfeited its language, exercised its authority,—nay, did more than the Legislative Body ever did, or had a right to do.

The Constitution had forbidden the Legislative Body to assume any portion of the judicial power<sup>37</sup>; it had only given it a mere *right of police* over its own members; it had not allowed it to inflict any

<sup>34</sup> See the 75th Art.

<sup>35</sup> Art. 85.

<sup>36</sup> I mentioned this same fact, which was known to all France, and stated in the journals of that sitting, in my protest to the Lyonnese, written on the 4th of September. Michaud noticed my assertion in the Tribune, and declared it to be false. Do you know in what manner this able man, this skilful logician, attempted to prove that I had lied as to the number of Deputies who assembled at the Odéon. He proposed to print the list of Deputies who joined the conspirators a month after that period, after considerable hesitation on their part, and from motives more or less respectable. The answer of the profound Bailleul was infinitely more conclusive: he observed, that I was one of the most active of the royal conspirators; that, consequently, all the facts I had advanced must necessarily be false, and all my arguments necessarily vicious; that the Legislative Body was even honoured by my reproaches; and that it ought proudly to adopt the motion for the order of the day. His advice was followed. What dignity! I sincerely hope, that Bailleul, and his worthy colleagues, will be able to preserve the same majesty in their answer to the troublesome arguments that are occasionally urged in the course of this Address.

<sup>37</sup> Art. 44 and 202.

severer punishment upon them than imprisonment for three days<sup>38</sup>; and yet this pretended Legislative Body, suddenly transformed into a court of law, tries and condemns a number of citizens, two and fifty representatives, and two Directors; decides upon the fact; applies the punishment; and delivers over to the discretion of the other three Directors the unhappy objects of their persecution<sup>39</sup>?

The Constitution had declared, that no member of the Legislative Body should be subject to accusation for any thing which he might say or write during the exercise of his functions<sup>40</sup>. Yet these new judges, not content with usurping the privilege of deciding, that those who do not entertain what they call *Republican opinions*, cannot be members of the Legislative Body, even reproach them with their thoughts. They not only condemn but actually punish them for those thoughts, and declare them sufficient to render their election illegal and null<sup>41</sup>.

The Constitution had limited the authority of the Directory to the execution of the laws. It had refused them the right of making laws<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> Art. 63.

<sup>39</sup> See the provisions of the law of the 5th of September.

<sup>40</sup> Art. 110.

<sup>41</sup> It is evident, say the Directory, in their message of the 4th of September, that Imbert Colomès is not a Republican, and consequently cannot sit in the Legislative Body as representative of the French people any more than Matthew Dumas, Gomicourt, and many others, *of whose attachment to royalty we shall hereafter adduce incontestible proofs*. See also the preamble to the law of the 5th of September.

<sup>42</sup> Constitutional Act, Art. 144. Penal Code, Art. 623.

They



They were equally interdicted the exercise of all judicial functions <sup>43</sup>. They were obliged to give up, without delay, to the courts of law, even private citizens who had been arrested by their orders; yet, on the 4th of September, we read in the streets directorial laws, which inflicted capital punishments with new forms; and on the succeeding day the Directory received, from the pretended Legislative Body, the right of choosing the place to which the deported persons were to be sent, that is to say, to pronounce a second judgment, by fixing the nature and extent of the punishment they were destined to suffer.

Such were the violations of the Constitution of which these Legislators, these Directors were guilty in their conduct to us; but why do I talk of Legislators and Directors? I scarcely find among these audacious violators of the Constitution any men who had themselves a constitutional title; I scarcely find among those, who thus annulled the elections of their colleagues, any men who held their own seats in virtue of a free and lawful election. They were almost all of them members of that Convention, which sprang from amidst the poniards of September, and supported itself by the cannon of Vendemiaire; I look in vain for representatives of the people among them; I descry none but assassins of the people.

Why do I talk of the Constitution, and of violated laws, when the very first principles ad-

<sup>43</sup> Constitutional Act, Art. 202. 145. Penal Code, Art. 63, 634, 635.

mitted by all societies, consecrated by the universal assent of nations, were openly infringed on this occasion? Why speak of forms instituted for the trial of Representatives or of Directors, when the very forms that give protection to the private citizen, when accused of any crime, were scandalously abandoned? Why talk of the prerogative of our legal inviolability, when common justice was refused, when the sacred rights of nature themselves were trodden under foot? Who ever beheld such a sight? What a scene of disgrace was exhibited to the country! The same men make laws and instantaneously apply them. They are, at once, juries, judges, accusers, and parties; and what parties! the most ardent, the most cruel of enemies! No discussion is opened. They scarcely listen to a rapid perusal of a few documents produced against two of the persons accused. None of them are heard in their own defence; no one is summoned to appear; no advocate stands forward in their behalf; no delay is allowed; no rejection, no denial received. The votes are publicly given in presence of those same men who provoke vengeance, and inflict it, in the midst of bayonets, at the very mouth of the cannon. A simple relative majority is admitted; or, to speak more correctly, five or six voices only are heard, and these impose laws on their silent colleagues. . . .

Gods! Do the wild beasts, when stimulated by excessive hunger, rush more impetuously on their prey, than such judges on the victims of their rage?

What

What an aggravation of their crime does it appear, too, when we reflect, that the men whom they treated in this manner, were their own colleagues, were daily assembled with them in the temple of the laws, associated with them in the exercise of the noblest and most grateful of all functions, and connected with them not only as men and citizens, but farther by that confraternity which is so pleasing to minds capable of feeling its value; when we consider, that the first victims sacrificed by the three Directors, were the two very men who partook of their power and of their honours, with whom they maintained that daily intercourse, which softens the most obdurate hatred; that one of them was their old friend, and that the other was a man, whose disposition was so excellent, and whose manners were so mild, that he never could have an enemy? Wretches! if there were nothing in these considerations capable of exciting your forbearance, at least you might have learnt to respect yourselves by respecting them! Why did you not affect some regard for the station which you held? Why did you not reflect that you were exposed to the eyes of the whole nation, of which you have made yourselves the chiefs, and of which you call yourselves the legislators? Why, above all, did you not perceive that you were offering a terrible example to the numerous enemies that press you on every side; marking out a short and ready way by which they may hereafter reach yourselves, and affording a sanction beforehand to those proscriptions of which you will assuredly become hereafter the victims?

H 2

They



They acknowledged themselves,—admire their candour!—they acknowledged that they had departed from the line which had been traced by the Constitution. “But the means which that Constitution supplied were insufficient for its defence; they violated it for an instant in order to preserve it; they disobeyed it out of pure love to it . . . .”

Frenchmen! remark, in the first place, the horrid blasphemy which they here utter against that Constitution, whose name is incessantly in their mouths, and which they exalt as the most perfect production of the human mind! What! does it fail not from an accident, but in its very basis? What! does it contain within itself the principle of its own dissolution? Had it not foreseen the very simple case of a minority in the Councils, and in the Directory, forming a conspiracy;—or had it so ill-contrived the form of elections and the balance of powers, that the majority themselves might become conspirators and seek to destroy it with their own hands? Who can now convince us, that its authors, having thus been guilty of one strange omission, have not been guilty of others more important? Who can convince us, that the nation which did not discover this has not also been deceived in respect of the other parts of it? And how can we believe, that a constitution, which, according to them, was unprovided with the necessary means of existing for two years, is nevertheless

theless calculated to raise France to the highest degree of happiness and glory? Ah! if it were true, that we had conspired to destroy it, what better apology for our conduct could we have desired than the audacious reproaches which these men urge against it?

*The means which the Constitution presented were insufficient to preserve it.* Let us reduce this vague remark to its precise meaning, and understand each other, if that be possible. Let them answer this question:—Were the majority of the Legislative Body accomplices in the royal conspiracy, or were they not?

If they were accomplices, if the Directors knew this beforehand, and had proofs of it, I will again ask them,—Why they did not denounce and prosecute all the criminals? Why, in their memorable sitting of the 4th of September, they only deported fifty-four instead of deporting five hundred, as they had the power to do? Or, since they shewed mercy to the greater number, why they did not, at least, publish the proofs against them in order to justify their own conduct, and to convince the people, that their unconstitutional measures were rendered necessary by the corruption of the majority themselves?

But if, on the contrary, they were not accomplices, as we ought to believe, since Boullay, their great orator<sup>44</sup>, has positively assured us that it is so,

<sup>44</sup> An authority the more respectable, as he assures us, that he has a great confidence in his own observations. See the sitting of the fourth complementary day.

so, another question remains to be put: Would the majority have received their denunciation, or would

Since this Boullay has attracted my notice once more, I cannot refrain from saying a few words about him. This man is not so wicked as he is generally believed to be in France, and as his treachery makes him appear. He has a mind naturally contracted; and a wretched vanity is the *primum mobile* of his conduct. He founded his claim to the representation of his department on certain homilies on *the Religion of our Fathers*; and his claim was admitted. He remained a long time among us in a state of obscurity, whence he was first extricated by his speech on the freedom of religious worship. This speech, destitute, like all his other speeches, of fire, originality, and real talent, but distinguished by a certain kind of forensic logic which consists in arranging absurdities in proper order, and accompanying them with an argumentative gesture; filled with all the common-place invectives against refractory priests, and delivered with an oily smoothness, produced some effect in the assembly; they did him the honour to order it to be printed, and three copies to be delivered to each member. This honour proved his ruin. From that time he conceived that he was destined to play an important part. We saw him insensibly assume a greater degree of consequence. He hesitated, for some time, which party he should espouse. Several members of our party were pleased with his wheedling tone; and, agreeably to their usual liberality of confidence, would willingly have promoted him to the office of secretary, as they did that General Jourdan, who so worthily answered their expectations. At length the commendations bestowed on him by Poultier, who had compared him to Mirabeau, the well-founded hope of shining with greater splendour in the opposite party, of attaining, in time and by labour, to the glory of Bailleul, of Guyvernon, of Barrhailhon, and of some others, fixed him irrevocably with the mountaineers. He offered himself to one of the Directors, received his wages, became his orator, and prepared, under his orders, the revolution of the 4th of September. He was seen to enter the directorial palace at six o'clock that morning. He obtained the honour of being reporter to that famous committee which was to save the country. He proposed, in his wisdom, and more particularly in his humanity, that mild measure of deporting his colleagues, and thereby satiated his lust of fame, convinced as he



would they not? If they maintain, that this honest and upright majority, who were staunch friends to the Constitution, would have rejected the denunciation though supported by proofs; they must be sensible, that those proofs were not demonstrative, since they could not produce conviction in the minds of these fair and candid men; and, in that case, how could they be deemed sufficiently convincible by themselves? And with what face can they present them to the nation as an irrefragable justification of their conduct?

But would this majority have admitted the denunciation, decreed the act of accusation, and supported the majority of the Directory? In that case, their revolutionary measures were useless; the Constitution was put in force, and the country was saved.

---

is, that he shall go down to posterity in the company of the immortal law of the 5th of September. It is known what a glorious career he has since pursued. He has spoken on all the measures to be taken, and sometimes even on measures already agreed on, not being willing, as he says himself, that the assembly should lose any of his speeches. The mountaineers, who despise and who will destroy him, whenever they deem it necessary, were not afraid of having their most cruel laws proposed by a member of the New Third, whose hands were yet unstained with blood. Only the other day, in his report upon the nobles, he went beyond his new associates; so that it became necessary for some of the fraternity to bring him back to the proper standard; and Chenier, among others, preached humanity to him. As obstinacy forms no trait in his character, he immediately abandoned his project, although thoroughly matured, not from conviction, he said, but from that love of peace which burns in his heart. So far has a deputy, who was elected in March, travelled in so short a time. What immortal honour for the department which has made such a present to France!

*The means which the Constitution supplied were not sufficient for its defence;* but is that the question? Was it the will of the nation that such means only should be employed, or was it not? That was the only point for your consideration. If such was their will; if they had given their sanction to those means, as well as to the other parts of the Constitution, who are you that presume to decide on their imperfection or their insufficiency? Who are you that pretend to save the people in your own manner and not in theirs? Who are you that affect to know their wants and their happiness better than themselves? Is it, then, according to your own miserable systems, or in conformity with their supreme will, that you ought to regulate your obedience and your conduct? Ah! what would become of human societies, if it were necessary to wait for the individual approbation of every member before you exact his submission to the laws!

*The means which the Constitution presented were insufficient to save it!* But is not the first and most efficacious means of preserving a constitution, a religious observance of every part of it? Ought not these profound politicians to have known, that the great moral force by which governments are supported consists in the people being habituated to that kind of veneration of which they are the objects;—that every infraction of the laws, especially on the part of their supreme guardians, by despoiling them of that happy magic which surrounds and protects them, opens the way to a  
thousand

thousand fresh infractions; and that, in this case, the holy fabric is no sooner touched than destroyed? Ought they not, particularly, to have reflected, if they felt any compassion for their unfortunate country, that, after a Revolution in which all those habits of order had been broken by the licentiousness of revolutionary maxims, and the instability of revolutionary institutions, in which the most sacred laws, incessantly sacrificed to pretexts of public safety, had left the people exposed to the influence of every bad passion, and to the mercy of every unprincipled faction, when they had begun, as they had for the last two years, to conceive an attachment for permanent laws, and to resume that kind of veneration to which I adverted before, suddenly to sap this rising religion by a signal infraction, again to talk of violating the law in order to preserve liberty, was to plunge once more into a state of anarchy for which no remedy could thenceforth be formed, and to strike despair into the hearts of all good citizens?

*The means which the Constitution presented were insufficient to save it!* What is it they say? What! those means were not sufficient for them! What! those forms imposed restraints upon them! What light does this confession throw upon their designs? But those forms could only impose restraints upon factions, against which they had been established as a rampart. They were the most precious part of the whole Constitution. They had been so contrived as to be useful to all the real friends of liberty, and vain in the hands of the factious; as  
to



to be efficacious for those who sincerely endeavoured to defend the Constitution, and impotent only for such as, under the pretext of supporting, should labour to subvert it.

Observe with what wisdom these tutelary forms had been instituted! A supreme tribunal had been established for the purpose of trying such Legislators and Directors as should be accused of any crime; and it was rendered wholly independent on the Legislative Body and the Directory, in order that, having no kind of connexion with either, it might not be exposed to be influenced by the spirit of party, nor by any of those interests which occasionally divide the senate and the Government.

The members of this tribunal were elected by the people in the different departments; and they could not fix their residence in the same commune with the Legislative Body and the Directory, in order that they might be wholly unaffected even by the influence of local circumstances.

It was rendered indispensably necessary that the denunciation should be received by the Legislative Body; that the parties accused should be summoned, and heard, and that the denunciation should be read three times, in order that every opportunity might be afforded for the discovery of truth, that the wisdom of the deliberations might be ensured by their maturity, and that reason might be the sole arbiter to the total exclusion of passion.

Lastly, as well in the tribunal of the High National Court, as in the Legislative Body, it was, by the majority of *their* votes, who were elected  
by

by the people, that the accusation was to be preferred and the judgment pronounced, in order that the sentence might be considered as an emanation of the national justice, and as the voice of the people themselves. And by whom could their opinion be better declared than by the men whom they knew and had chosen? And where could we expect to find a greater union of integrity, patriotism, and knowledge, than in the majority of those whom they had entrusted with the important task of framing laws for them, and into whose hands they had consigned their dearest interests?

Ah! what body of men, except a **FACTIOUS MINORITY**, could ever inveigh against such institutions as these, and complain of their insufficiency? What avenue do they close, but that which leads to ambition and revolt? What ought the Constitution, then, to have substituted for these salutary forms? No doubt it should have suffered a small band of legislators, surreptitiously assembled, to become in an instant the accusers, and the judges of their colleagues, to dissolve the national representation, and to decide, that they alone were pure, virtuous, and faithful. It should thus have abandoned the persons of those representatives, and the interests of the nation, to the hazard of a surprise, to the hands of him who should enjoy a pre-eminence in skill or in strength! It should have placed justice and truth on the points of a few bayonets! This was no doubt an opinion worthy of those men who were solely indebted for their elevation to the cannon of Vendemiaire, and who  
cannon-

cannonaded the people in order to obtain the honour of representing them !

There was a time, though, when those same forms were deemed sufficient by these same men ; there was a time when they enforced their observance ; when they applied them without any scruple ; when they would even, had it been possible, have rendered them more tardy and solemn in the trial and punishment of criminals. It is true, that the objects of prosecution, at that time, were not such conspirators as we are ; they were not accused of such a horrible plot as that of producing a counter-revolution by the means of justice and humanity. It was nothing more than a Babœuf and a Drouet, supported by several Representatives of the People, protected by a member of the Directory, having all the Jacobins at their orders, and intending nothing more than merely to massacre one half of France for the happiness of the other. The proofs of their designs were clearer than the day ; but some attention was due to such old friends ; and such exalted patriotism could not be condemned so hastily. Oh shame ! Oh crime ! Thus the vilest of villains were allowed to avail themselves of all the forms that protect innocence ; the enemies of all order enjoyed all the benefit of the laws ; the Constitution was sufficient to repel an attack which tended, not only to destroy it, but to subvert the whole order of society ; and it was only for us that common justice, now become too merciful, was to be changed, and its course to be accelerated ; it was for us alone, who put the country  
in



in such imminent danger, that it was necessary to violate all the established laws, in order to save it! O! ye, who thus pretend to be its deliverers! O! ye, who dare assert that the existing forms were no longer sufficient to reach us! I appeal to you whether this were really the case.—Admit, for an instant, the supposition that, under the constitutional system, a factious minority had wished to oppress and dissolve the National Representation, and to subject the whole nation to their own tyrannical sway; tax your own fertile imaginations to find what they could have done or said. If you can shew me that they could have done or said any thing else than what you yourselves have done and said; if you can point out to me any other conduct that they could have observed, any other excuses that they could have offered, I consent to give up my cause, to acknowledge that I have lied, and to proclaim to the world that you are the benefactors and saviours of your country.

*The means which the Constitution presented were insufficient to save it!* I admit this.—The work was incomplete; a case had not been foreseen; the nation had observed a profound silence on this case; their will had not settled what should be done in such a conjuncture;—well! what inference is to be drawn from this? that our adversaries had a right to interpret this silence? to act upon such interpretation? to establish, to ordain, of their own sole authority, what the nation had not established or ordained? and ordain what? establish what? That they themselves, who were

the accusers, should also be the judges, the sole judges? That they might try according to forms unknown before? That they might become constituent legislators, in order to erect themselves afterwards into absolute despots?

Most certainly not. But since the Constitution was insufficient, they ought to have referred to the authority whence it emanated. Since the national will had not foreseen this new case, its decision should have been called for. Since there was no tribunal competent to decide the question, the whole of it should have been submitted to the grand tribunal, that of the French Citizens, which they affect to consider as the sovereign. At least, after having taken the decision upon themselves, under the pretext of the extreme urgency of the case, they ought to have been anxious to have their judgment examined and revised; to have waited, in respectful silence, until their provisional measures should receive some stamp of legality from the free sanction of their fellow-citizens. Instead of this, what line of conduct did they observe? Behold them, in a masterly tone, dictating laws to that sovereign nation; causing it to be proclaimed, by the sound of cannon, that they had saved the people; restraining, by the operation of terror, that opinion which it was their duty to consult and to follow; and imposing on France, that silence which they ought to have imposed on themselves! Behold them preventing the people not only from declaring their sentiments and forming their decisions, but even from comparing facts; from acquiring a  
knowledge

knowledge of them; from listening to a recital of them; tearing from their hands our protests and our defence; and forbidding them, not merely to declare in our favour, but even to yield to *their* authority, from *conviction*<sup>45</sup>! And yet they dare to

<sup>45</sup> In the Department of the *Gard* a Citizen was condemned to be publicly exposed in the market-place, and afterwards to be imprisoned for two years and kept in irons, for reading my Address to the *Lyonnese*, that was written on the 4th of September, to three women. This suspicious spirit, this savage severity, still exists in full force, as will be seen by the difficulty that will be found in circulating this publication. I foresee that the greater part of my fellow-citizens will know nothing of it, but from accounts which will be given of it by Poulitier and his associates. It is true that it will be a faithful account. It may, indeed, be anticipated, and will be couched in nearly the following terms: "Camille Jordan has just rung his bells. He has made a last appeal to the companions of Jesus and of the Sun. It is useless for good citizens to read this disgusting work: the known character of the Author, an emigrant, a fanatic, a royalist, is a sufficient index to the book. Considered as a literary composition, it is nothing more than a miserable monkish declamation, almost worthy of the twelfth century. Considered as a political performance, its principles excite horror. The Author throws off the mask, and frankly avows that there were royalists in the Assembly, so that you see the conspiracy did exist. He reproves our armies, so that you see he was not interested in their triumphs. He compassionates the emigrants and the priests, so that you see he regrets the ancient system. He blames the project of a descent upon England; this suffices to prove him the faithful agent of Pitt. He reverts to his system of *natural vengeance*; this is offering a little word of encouragement to the assassins and agitators of the South. He incessantly invokes the general will;—a *Vendémiaire* stratagem for destroying the Republic. In short, in every part of his book he incites to civil war and a counter-revolution. No citizen can, certainly, be seduced from his duty by so contemptible a libel. It is calculated to produce a contrary effect, and to make the revolution of the 4th of September more popular. Nevertheless it becomes the wisdom of the Government to prevent such publications from contaminating the eyes of the patriots. Do not those, who wish to obtain a just degree of information on all these subjects, derive sufficient instruction from our journals?"

call



call themselves the deliverers and the friends of the people; and dare to talk of Liberty and the Republic! Great Gods! what a new species of tyranny is this! To reduce a whole people to the most abject state of submission to insolent tyrants, and to make them, at the same moment, proclaim themselves happy and free! I think I see Nero ordering the Romans to call him the benefactor of the human race; and to place him, during his life, on the list of Gods!

If still they neglected to appeal to the people, and to adopt their opinion as the rule of their own conduct, they had a very wise motive for so doing, which I had almost forgotten to mention; we had corrupted the public opinion! at least they affirmed this in several of their speeches. We corrupt the public opinion! We, who, exercising no authority, disposing of no treasures, nominating no agents, confined solely to our speeches and our services, could have no other means of seduction than reason, could hold out no other allurements than happiness; while they, the fountain of all favours, the possessors of every resource, could freely exercise all the means which result from the indulgence of the passions and the gratification of criminal propensities!

We corrupt the public opinion! at what a time? When a long and cruel revolution had taught the people, by so many striking examples, to know their true interests, and to distinguish their true friends. They could not, then, have much relish for these republican institutions after experience had enabled

enabled them to appreciate their merits ! Or, if they did relish them, having yielded with such facility to the impressions of an opposite faction, they must have been deemed unworthy to enjoy them ? Their fate, then, is to be deplored, in having a Constitution that consecrates the general will, and yet makes every thing subservient to their unstable opinion !

We corrupt the public opinion ! Be it so ; admit that it was corrupted ; but it was with us ; the people were misled, but they approved our conduct. You hear what they say, People of France ! this memorable confession has issued from their lips :—THEY REIGN IN OPPOSITION TO YOUR WISHES. Which now will be suffered to triumph ; your own errors, which you love ; or their wisdom, which you detest ? It is for you to decide, whether you will suffer a small band of these philosophers, who dare to complain at once of the depravity of your opinion, and the insufficiency of your Constitution, after having violated all your laws, to subjugate all your minds ; after having compelled your submission to their yoke, to reproach you with your error, and thus to add insult to outrage. It is for you to decide, whether you will permit a few individuals, who have attained to supreme power by incessant invocations of the general will, now to address you, in all their acts, in a language which is substantially this :—“ Our opinion is the infallible  
“ organ of truth ; the Republic is centered in our  
“ will ; the country in our persons ; liberty in our  
I “ power ;

“ power ; and there is but one political dogma,  
 “ which is to obey us and to believe us.”

The audacity, the absurdity, the inutility of the excuse, *that the means prescribed by the Constitution were insufficient to save it*, are thus established in a thousand ways. I have shewn, that, admitting the proofs of the conspiracy to be as valid as they are nugatory, such admission cannot afford the smallest excuse for their conduct towards us ; for the violation of the Constitution of which they were guilty in proscribing us.

But even this is not all. Let us admit that such proscription was lawful, and that they might equitably violate all forms and all principles in their conduct to us. “ The Constitution,” they say, “ had not taken any precautions against its defenders ; it was necessary to lose sight of it, for an instant, in order to put a stop to their criminal manœuvres.” Admitted. But, at least, they ought to have confined themselves to this violation ; and, as our plot was the sole cause of it, it ought not to have extended farther than to ourselves. At least, as soon as the conspirators were seized and dispersed, the legislators ought to have hastened to restore the Constitution to its former splendour and power. But observe by how many other violations this grand violation was accompanied. Examine what connexion could be found to subsist between our pretended royal conspiracy and so many unlawful measures. Two and fifty Legislators and two Directors had formed a conspiracy ; but was that a reason for seizing, in a mass, in virtue of a blind



*ex post facto* law, a crowd of writers, most of whom were as dear to the literary world as to their country<sup>46</sup>, in order to condemn them without submitting a single page of their writings to any one of their judges; and although a great number of those judges had never read them; to condemn them, when they had only exercised that imprescriptible right which the Constitution secures of censuring or praising the conduct of the established authorities; and thus to destroy, at one blow, all that liberty of the press which is the last rampart of political freedom<sup>47</sup>.

We had conspired!—But was that a reason for annulling the elections in more than forty Departments, and for depriving upwards of an hundred and fifty Representatives of the People of their seats? How could the Constitution be violated in a more audacious manner than by thus annulling elections, in which the forms of that Constitution had been most rigidly adhered to, without entering into a discussion of the circumstances by which they were attended, without casting a single look on the official statement of the returning officers<sup>48</sup>? What! because Duverne de Presle had affirmed that it was the intention of the Royalists to influence the

<sup>46</sup> Who could believe that they did not blush to include in this number a man the most unconnected with politics, both from the temper of his mind and his usual occupations—the respectable Abbé Sicard, the Institutor and the Father of the Establishment for the Deaf and Dumb; a man who, by this institution, had done honour to his country, and merited the applause of the whole human race. They attacked *him* whom the assassins of September had spared!

<sup>47</sup> See the law of 6th of September respecting the Journalists.

<sup>48</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Art. 1, 2, 3, 4.

elections, it must be inferred, as a necessary consequence, that they had absolutely dictated the returns! Did their wishes bespeak their power! Their intentions proclaim their success! But did the validity of the elections really depend on the opinions of the elected? And where was that article of the Constitution to be found which decided, that an opinion favourable to royalty was to operate as a disqualification, and that even the will of the People was inadequate to confer the office of magistrate on any others than men who should profess an *immoveable* admiration of the totality of our new institutions?

We had conspired!—But was that a reason for robbing the whole nation of their most inviolable rights; for excluding from the Primary Assemblies a vast number of persons who, enjoying all the qualifications of citizens, were entitled to vote, under the ridiculous pretext that they were Nobles, or the relations of individuals who had been proscribed<sup>49</sup>? Was it a reason for dictating laws to those Primary Assemblies which constitute the<sup>50</sup> sovereign from whom all laws proceed; for pretending to bind by oaths those who can only be bound by their own will? And what oaths?—Oaths of hatred to a form of government which an individual is allowed to esteem, if he be not allowed to restore it; oaths of hatred to institutions which the people themselves, if such be their pleasure, have a right to call for and establish among them<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> Idem, Art. 8, 9.

<sup>50</sup> The French Constitution, Art. 2.

<sup>51</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Art. 10, 11.

We had conspired !—But was that a reason for arresting men <sup>52</sup>, who had been acquitted by a military commission, established by Merlin himself ; for bringing them to a second trial for the same offence before another tribunal ; for condemning, in an instant, and without any examination, those who had every presumption of innocence in their favour ; for taking them out of the power of the law, and for punishing them for a plot formed during their captivity ? Was it a reason for including in the same sentence individuals whose names seemed to have been taken by chance, as it were, from the general mass of citizens, individuals against whom our enemies have not even taken the trouble to advance a single fact <sup>53</sup> ? For embarking also, on board the fatal vessel, the true Bark of Charon, those victims of misfortune, whom the law indeed forbade to set foot on our territory, but who had incurred the penalty of no laws ; who were, on the contrary, entitled to all the protection that humanity could afford, when cast by the tempest on our coasts ; and for thus converting shipwreck into a crime <sup>54</sup> ?

We had conspired !—But did that authorise the Councils to give to the Directory a number of unconstitutional prerogatives which the Legislative Body themselves had no power to assume ?

The Constitution had ordained that the Electoral Assemblies should appoint the successors of those judges who should leave the *Tribunal of Cassation*,

<sup>52</sup> Brothier and La Villeurnois.

<sup>53</sup> Doffonville, Raffet, &c.

<sup>54</sup> The Emigrants who were shipwrecked at Calais.



and had only allowed the Directory to appoint the Commissary of that court<sup>55</sup>; whereas by the law of the 5th of September the Directory are empowered to replace one third of the judges by men chosen by themselves, and in such a manner that they will survive those who have been chosen by the people, and will keep their places for four years<sup>56</sup>. By this means a most essential portion of the judicial power is subjected to the influence of the Directory; by this means the Directory, who are liable to be tried by the High National Court, nominates a part of the judges who are to form it; thus securing impunity for themselves, and rendering their responsibility a mere chimera.

The Constitution had also given the exclusive right of appointing the judges of the Provincial Courts to the Electoral Assemblies<sup>57</sup>; but the law of the 5th of September authorizes the Directory to appoint to all vacant offices, and gives to their appointments the same force and the same duration as to those made by the Electoral Assemblies<sup>58</sup>. Thus all the private tribunals are also placed under the immediate influence of the Executive Directory, and the distinction and independance which the Constitution established between these two powers are again set aside.

Lastly, the Constitution had decreed that the judicial functions could not be exercised by the Directory<sup>59</sup>; but the law of the 5th of September not

<sup>55</sup> Articles 41, 259, 261.

<sup>56</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Articles 27, 28, 29.

<sup>57</sup> Constitution, Article 41.

<sup>58</sup> Articles 5, 6.

<sup>59</sup> Articles 202—145.

only enables them to punish, at their pleasure, the pretended conspirators and periodical writers, by allowing them to fix the place to which they shall be deported, but farther invests them with the strange power of pronouncing, by their own authority, a sentence of deportation on any priests whom they may choose to charge with having disturbed the public peace<sup>60</sup>; that is to say, by authorizing them to decide on the offences of such priests, it confers on them real judicial powers; and by empowering them afterwards to apply the punishment to those offences, it unites in their persons the functions of juries and of judges which the Constitution had kept separate<sup>61</sup>.

We had conspired!—But was that a reason for annihilating that freedom of worship which the Constitution sanctions and the People claim, either by ordering thousands of ecclesiastics to quit their country<sup>62</sup>, for not having taken, at the beginning of the revolution, an oath which they were not commanded to take, the object of which has long ceased to exist, and the exaction of which could not be enforced without folly and even without a crime; or by compelling all the clergy who shall remain in France, immediately to desist from the discharge of their functions, unless they subscribe a new declaration which they have not a right to exact from private citizens, and which they only exact from the clergy because they expect that their religious habits

<sup>60</sup> Article 24.

<sup>61</sup> Articles 237, 238.

<sup>62</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Article 23.

will oppose such an invincible obstacle to compliance with the demand as to furnish them with a new pretext for the proscription of the religion which they profess<sup>63</sup>.

We had conspired !—But was that a reason for reversing the whole order of our criminal jurisprudence ? The Constitution had decreed that no man could be taken out of the jurisdiction of the judges assigned him by law ; that every man who should be apprehended must be taken before the officer of the police ; that no man could be tried for crimes which render him liable to corporal or ignominious punishment, but in consequence of a charge received by a jury, or by the Legislative Body ; that the director of the jury should be specially empowered to prosecute all offences against public order<sup>64</sup> ; the Constitution had formed of all these articles a strong rampart for the defence of the liberty of the People ; and if it admitted some exceptions, it was only in respect of the sea and land forces, who were subjected to particular laws<sup>65</sup> : both as to the form of their trial and the nature of their punishment : but the law of the 5th of September, confounding all these principles, subjects to the judgment of the military tribunals all individuals who shall be accused of emigration ; all those even who, having obtained a provisional erasure of their names from the fatal list, shall not leave the kingdom within the term prescribed by their enemies ; and all such as

<sup>63</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Article 26.

<sup>64</sup> Constitution, Article 204, 222, 237, 242.

<sup>65</sup> Idem, Article 290.

shall



shall afford an asylum to emigrants, or even maintain a correspondence with them; it leaves to a General the nomination of the seven judges who are to decide on their fortunes and their lives in the space of four and twenty hours; and these tribunals are not even erected in the departments in which the parties reside, and in the registers of which their names are inscribed, but in any department in which it shall be deemed expedient to arrest them<sup>66</sup>.

It is needless to say more. Such, such are the consequences of that 4th of September, which they have the impudence to call a glorious day! Such, such are the actions of those men who have dared to charge us with having conspired against the Constitution, and with being the enemies of the people.

THE CONSTITUTION VIOLATED IN MORE THAN FORTY OF ITS ARTICLES; THE RESPECT WHICH IT COMMANDED IRREVOCABLY DESTROYED; THE NATIONAL REPRESENTATION VIOLENTLY DISPERSED AND DISSOLVED; THE SHADOW OF A LEGISLATIVE BODY REDUCED TO THE MOST ABJECT SLAVERY; THE WILL AND THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE TREATED WITH CRUEL DERISION; THE DESPOTISM OF THREE MEN SUBSTITUTED FOR THAT LIBERTY WHICH WAS OBTAINED AT THE EXPENCE OF SOMUCH BLOOD; THE GLORY OF OUR ARMIES TARNISHED; AN INFAMOUS BANKRUPTCY PROCLAIMED; THE SOURCES OF WEALTH DRIED UP; HOPE EXTINGUISHED IN EVERY BOSOM; AND THAT PUBLIC

<sup>66</sup> Law of the 5th of September, Article 16, et sequent.

SPIRIT, WHICH CONSTITUTES THE LAST RESOURCE OF THE COUNTRY, ALMOST ANNIHILATED BY GRIEF AT SEEING THE NATION AGAIN PLUNGED INTO THAT GULPH WHENCE IT EAGERLY STROVE TO EXTRICATE ITSELF, BY THE FATAL EXPERIENCE OF THE TRIUMPH OF A FEW FACTIOUS INDIVIDUALS OVER A WHOLE PEOPLE, AND OF THE IMPOTENCE OF THE MORAL EFFORT OF OPINION AGAINST A RAMPART OF BAYONETS.

Gods! and, in the midst of these public and general calamities, how many private calamities are sustained, how many tears shed in secret, which our enemies alone have caused to flow! But, Frenchmen! they have dared to boast of their humanity. "They remembered"—say they—"that they were the representatives of an humane nation; no act of violence disgraced that glorious day; no scaffold was erected"<sup>67</sup>: they no doubt displayed an admirable clemency in their forbearance to assassinate you! A blessing, as the Roman orator observed, the greatest that can be expected and received from banditti!<sup>68</sup> But was even this humanity their own, or was it yours? What merit was there in not committing murders when no resistance was experienced; in not being cruel when cruelty was useless and might be fatal? "What Corsair, what Pirate,"—would the same orator again exclaim, "ever stained his prey with blood when he was able to carry off

<sup>67</sup> See the Report of the Law of the 5th of September, before quoted.

<sup>68</sup> *Sit quidem beneficium, quandoque accipi à Latrone beneficium majus non potest.* In M. M. ANTONIUM, Philippica 3.

" his

“ his spoils without shedding any <sup>69</sup> ?” But who can say what blood would have been shed, if on those dreadful days your prudence had not restrained your energy, and if, by bargaining with a band of ferocious tyrants, you had not consented to purchase your tranquillity and your lives at the expence of your Constitution and your Laws ?

Tranquillity ! Life !—Alas ! who can henceforth answer for the security of either ? What new terror is preparing at the very moment when they are protesting against the renovation of terror ? Already behold the revolutionary tribunals established in every department ! The lives of the people, hitherto protected by inviolable laws, are now given up, on the slightest pretext of emigration, of an asylum afforded to an emigrant, of a correspondence maintained with him, into the hands of one individual who abandons them to seven others devoted to his orders ; and that no vestige of liberty may remain in such an institution, this man is not chosen by the people, but nominated by the Directory on whom he depends ; and that every trace of humanity may be obliterated, the ministers of this new species of revolutionary justice are not selected from the class of private citizens, who might happen to administer it too mildly, but are chosen from that class which, from their martial habits, are more disposed than any other to treat all forms with contempt ; it is to soldiers that such a dreadful power over the lives and fortunes of Frenchmen is entrusted ; to men who

<sup>69</sup> *Quis pirata tam barbarus, ut cum integram prædam sine sanguine habere posset, cruenta spolia detrahere mallet ?* Pro Roscio.



have served their apprenticeship to the magistracy in fields of slaughter; and that judges thus prepared may not be allowed one moment for reflection, when called to decide questions the most complicated, and interests the most dear, they are ordered to pronounce and execute their horrible sentences within twenty-four hours<sup>70</sup>.

What room for reflection does this dreadful regulation afford! The thief, the murderer, will still be tried by a jury, will still enjoy the privilege of those forms which were instituted for the protection of innocence; while the honest, the virtuous citizen, on the slightest suspicion founded on mistake, or suggested by revenge, will be dragged to a barrack, and left at the discretion of a few grenadiers!

Thus are the days of proscription renewed! The shade of Robespierre himself, conjured up from the depths of hell, points out the victims which had escaped his rage, and unfolds the fatal lists which had been traced by his hand<sup>71</sup>. What a spectacle! A crowd of persons of all ranks and ages, which the affections of the soul, more powerful than the recollection of the calamities which they had experienced, had just brought back to the place of their birth, in order to solicit the privilege of dying there in peace;—a still greater number whom even tyranny itself could never induce to leave their country, but who, from cupidity, revenge, or innocent mistakes, had been placed on the list of emigrants: men who, from a presumption of their

<sup>70</sup> See the provisions of the Law of the 5th of September.

<sup>71</sup> It is well known that the greater part of the lists of emigrants were made out during the reign of terror.

innocence declared on a first examination, had trusted to that provisional justice, and to the clearness of their right, suddenly receive the merciless order to abandon interests so dear to the hands of strangers, and to quit their native soil<sup>72</sup>. They depart, and not one of them can say, at his departure, "I shall one day return to my home; I shall one day again behold this habitation of my fathers." They depart, and if they hesitate an instant, if sensibility prolong their sorrowful adieus, the delay costs them their life.—They depart, and all France is covered with their unfortunate bands, all families are plunged into grief and mourning, and the very guards themselves, who are stationed at our barriers, drop a tear as they pass; they depart, and from that moment the gates of France are closed upon them, and they hear nothing more of their country than distant sounds of death:—they are dead to all that they knew, to all that they possessed, to all that they loved; and, if the pressing wants of indigence, or the still more urgent calls of tenderness, tend to preserve the smallest trace of connection between them and the land which they lately inhabited; if the simple desire of assuring themselves of their existence lead them to yield to an invincible impulse, to write a single line to any/one of those who were dear

<sup>72</sup> It is true that they are allowed to solicit, from a foreign country, the definitive erasure of their names from the fatal lists; but we know from whom alone they can obtain it. And when the Directory have just ordered the erasures already made to be re-examined, we may easily judge what reason there is to expect new erasures. Those persons alone who, being able *to pay an exorbitant price for them*, can best dispense with them, will obtain them from these equitable judges.

to their hearts, the unfortunate objects of their affectionate solicitude are treated as their accomplices ; punishment becomes the reward of virtue, and the sword of the law stifles the cries of nature.

What another sight next presents itself to our eyes ! Some unhappy priests, after passing five years in misery and exile, had just returned to France ; they saluted their native soil ; they reposed, after their long sufferings, in the bosom of friendship ; and the joy of these first embraces is suddenly interrupted by a new mandate of proscription. Venerable old men are sent a second time to implore the pity of foreign nations ; they lose the hope of being entombed with their fathers ; and the simple and good people who blessed heaven for having restored their pastors to them, who surrounded them with every mark of tenderness and respect, who returned with additional transport to their religious duties, are suddenly deprived of all their innocent enjoyments. The chaunting of holy hymns is interrupted ; horrid persecution, under the name of law, stands erect in the portico of the temple ; the mortal silence of atheism is spread far around ; virtue flies in despair ; all hopes are extinguished ; all consolations disappear ; and the thousands who owe their wretchedness to them are rendered still more wretched.

After tracing misfortunes like these, shall I venture to speak of our own colleagues ? It is in their conduct towards them in particular, that our enemies boast of their clemency ; and it is there, in fact, that their humanity appears in a more admirable, a more affecting point of view. It must be  
admitted,



admitted, that such of us as fell into their hands were not massacred on the spot. They were too much afraid of displaying in the eyes of the multitude, that pomp of punishment which disgusts the people more than the subversion of all law. They were too much afraid of recalling to their minds, by the effusion of blood, the horrid reign of terror. But, if a check were imposed on the first impulse of their impatient rage, what cold refinement of cruelty did their subsequent conduct evince? What new punishment was inflicted, on their victims, more terrible than death itself? They were abandoned to the discretion of that Directory, whose actions they had censured, whose power they had balanced, and who were their most ferocious rivals, their most inveterate enemies. They were given up to them, in order that France might clearly perceive, that it was to their private hatred and not to the public good that these men were sacrificed; they were given up to them, that they might be indebted to their enemies for any relaxation of punishment or cruelty, which those enemies might deign to accord;—a species of suffering the most intolerable to a free and magnanimous mind! They traversed, in a vehicle destined for the vilest criminals, that country to which they had been accustomed to give laws. They were exposed, by the insolent conqueror, to the humiliating curiosity of the populace, and to the outrages of that very banditti which they had laboured to repress. They are at length deported; but a dreadful silence is observed as to the place of their destination; the regions they are to inhabit

inhabit are wrapped in horrid obscurity, and the ocean has no unknown coasts; Afric no deserts; the Indies no savage Isles; under the Tropics there are no burning sands; under the Poles no frozen mountains, which their imagination may not suggest as their destined habitation; and it is under this impression that they embark, that they lose sight of the French coast. What can there be in death more terrible to the heart of man? for what more dreadful separations can it give the signal? What do we regret on quitting life but our country, our relations, our friends, and all those cherished habits which constitute our existence? At least, on ascending the scaffold, the mind of the hero is exalted and supported by the mere sight of the instruments of death; at least, when he lays down his mortal coil, the heart of the virtuous man feels nourished by a sublime hope; he sees, after a short moment of pain, the most magnificent prospects open before him: but here, the Genius of Evil seems to have defeated the calculations of that beneficent Providence, whose will it is, that the end of the cruelties of the wicked shall be the beginning of the reward of the virtuous! These men are doomed to experience a long and barren interval between the termination of their mortal existence, and their entrance into immortality; they must traverse that interval alone; their grief will be solitary; and their agonies will be increased in proportion to the magnitude of their moral virtues, and the acuteness of their social feelings. It is against the *hearts* of those generous men,

men, who treated life with disdain and tortures with contempt, that they pointed their attacks; they made their affections their executioners; it is the father, the husband, the friend, the citizen, that are agonized, when the man is spared. You, who dare boast of the mildness of such treatment, only expose the baseness of your own unfeeling hearts. You think to display your clemency, and you only prove, that the first affections of human nature are strangers to your bosom. You endeavour to shew us, that you are humane, and you convince us that you are not even men.

What do I say? Who knows whether it is intended to preserve their lives? Whether the fatal order has not been given to terminate their existence on their voyage? Whether, even after they have arrived at their destined place, they will not be left to perish from misery and want; whether they will not fall victims to a murderous climate, in a land that devours its inhabitants, and thus have received a short prolongation of their existence only to expire, after a more painful agony, at a distance from their friends, and without a tear being shed on their graves? How many countries are there on which a man cannot set his foot without a certainty of extermination! How many mandates of deportation are tantamount to a sentence of death? Who can assure us, that the orders given to their savage conductor were not of this description? What security have we that this was not the case? Oh Gods!—our sole secu-

K

rity



rity consists in the sensibility of the Directory, and in their silence!

As for us who, by condemning ourselves to a voluntary exile, or by burying ourselves in obscure retreats, have hitherto been able to elude their vigilance, although it be certainly afflicting to lead a wandering and fugitive life, or to be shut out, as it were, from the light of the day; although it be still more afflicting to be torn from the society of those excellent friends who would mingle their tears with ours, and have deplored with us the calamities of France; although it be dreadful for those who, like me, had obtained from Heaven a country so justly dear, and so pleasant to inhabit, to be no longer able to enjoy its delightful prospects; to breathe the air which we loved; to wander over its ruins; and, as we contemplate them, to encourage a pleasing melancholy; and to become, in the very bloom of life, the objects of a proscription of which it is not possible to foresee the end;—we shall be careful, in the midst of so many public calamities and private misfortunes, not to utter any complaints at the fate which has befallen us; we will even return thanks to that supreme Providence, which directs all events to his own wise ends, for having rendered us worthy of suffering something in the cause of justice and truth. We feel a noble pride in pursuing the honourable paths that have been marked out by so many virtuous citizens and great men, proscribed, in all ages, by the tyrants of their country. Our  
 hearts

hearts rejoice at the thought, that we are the victims of the best of causes; and that the hatred of the wicked is directed against us for having afforded protection to innocence, and consolation to misfortune. Ah! the land of exile is the country of the good man; and the fruits which he gathers there conceal, beneath an apparent bitterness, an exquisite and intoxicating flavour.

Your Deputy, in particular, O Lyonnese! deems himself happy in having been proscribed, because he belonged to you, and had the courage to defend you. He now congratulates himself on having exercised those functions which, you know, he accepted with repugnance. He congratulates himself on having rendered himself worthy, by his proscription, of the singular marks of benevolence which you conferred on him. He bears, with joy and pride, the weight of a disgrace which constitutes his glory in your eyes, and which adds to your own.

And you, O my virtuous colleagues! O my worthy friends! you who were my guides and my models in that career of true patriotism, how gratifying is it to me, to have been allowed to share your fate! How gratifying to me, that our tyrants should have considered me as your competitor! How gratifying to me to be able to present myself to my friends, as to my enemies, in your illustrious company! Your names placed with mine on that list of honour, repeat what my heart had whispered, teach me what I had scarcely dared to hope, that I may have deserved well of my country.

Far from us, then, far from us all, be the criminal with which Camillus uttered as he withdrew from the walls of Rome! Far from us, even, O Frenchmen! be the simple desire of returning to the posts to which we were raised by your suffrages, if our return were to cost our country a single tear! Do not fear that our minds will be either irritated or debased by the redoubled strokes of adversity. Do not fear that we shall be guilty either of an inconsiderate rashness, or of a cowardly dereliction of our duty. Whether the good of our country require us to suppress our feelings and to conceal our sentiments, or whether it command us to brave all dangers, we shall ever be found ready for either alternative. The day on which we became your representatives, we ceased to be our own masters, and our misfortunes have only served to strengthen the bonds of union between us. . . . Frenchmen! virtuous men of all opinions and of all parties! suffer not that powerful phalanx which we still form beneath the standard of justice and truth to be broken and dispersed! Let not the dreadful defeat we have experienced make us despair of saving our country; such despair would be the greatest of all evils. Let hope be still cherished; let it still animate us to farther exertions! You, worthy representatives! who still act with the tyrants of your country, but who are distinguished from them and deplored by all honest citizens; though it be not in your power to do good, endeavour sometimes to prevent evil;

support



support the tottering state, and let your opposition, every day more energetic without ceasing to be prudent, convince the nation, that none but the most laudable motives induced you to remain in the most unlawful of assemblies. You, virtuous judges ! upright administrators ! whom your departments have still the happiness to possess, continue to exercise in private those virtues which are known to your fellow-citizens, but unknown to your tyrants ; let atrocious measures be softened by passing through your beneficent hands, and let the magistrate at least be better than the law. You, private citizens ! do not cease to call for those Primary Assemblies, of which no power on earth has a right to deprive you ; and although, by iniquitous exclusions, a vast number of citizens may be prevented from attending them ; although tyrannical conditions are sought to be imposed on others ; although you are threatened with a renovation of the system of terror ; go, with courage and with confidence, once more to give your votes. Be persuaded, that there is still in France such an immense majority of the friends of social order, that, even when decimated, there are in every part enough to repress the impious horde which have sworn to plunder your fortunes and to assassinate your persons. Let us thus imitate the indefatigable perseverance of the wicked. Let us persist in securing, by the energy of our conduct, the triumph of the laws ; and let us be convinced, that tyranny must ultimately yield to our continued and unanimous efforts !

And

And thou, eternal Providence! whom, in this age of atheism, I glory in acknowledging, in common with the sages of all ages; thou, who presidest in silence over all the revolutions of empires, and directest the course of worlds; fulfil, oh! fulfil, the wishes of the virtuous! Take pity on that beauteous land, and on a whole people who are exposed to the danger of being involved in the same destruction with it! Avert from us that dreadful futurity which opens upon the philosopher who shudders at the prospect! Keep our country from falling into that gulph into which its domestic enemies endeavour to plunge it; restore to it, with the laws that protect it, all the virtues which do honour to thee; and cause, at length, that order which is displayed in all thy works, to prevail in the institutions of men!

THE END.



